Exhibit 1

Page 1 1 2 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3) 4 In re) 5 LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDING INC., Chapter 11 6 et al., 7 Debtors. Case No. 8 08-13555 (SCC) 9 10 11 12 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF DR. THOMAS 13 TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2015 14 9:45 a.m. 15 16 17 18 19 Video deposition of DR. THOMAS 20 MARSONER, taken by Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. 21 and Lehman Brothers Commercial Paper Inc., at 22 the offices of Hogan Lovells, 875 Third Avenue, 23 New York, New York, before Brandon Rainoff, a 24 Federal Certified Realtime Reporter and Notary 25 Public of the State of New York.

1	
2	APPEARANCES
3	
4	
5	WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
6	Attorneys for Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. and
7	Lehman Brothers Commercial Paper Inc.
8	767 Fifth Avenue
9	New York, New York 10153-0119
10	212. 310. 8000
11	BY: DENISE ALVAREZ, ESQ.
12	212. 310. 8965
13	denise.alvarez@weil.com
14	JACQUELINE MARCUS, ESQ.
15	212. 310. 8130
16	jacqueline.marcus@weil.com
17	MAURICE HORWITZ, ESQ.
18	212. 310. 8883
19	maurice.horwitz@weil.com
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
              APPEARANCES (continued)
 2
 3
 4
 5
        HOGAN LOVELLS
        Attorneys for Dr. Thomas Marsoner
 6
                 875 Third Avenue
 7
 8
                 New York, New York 10022
 9
                 212. 918. 3000
10
        BY:
               PIETER VAN TOL, ESQ.
                 212, 909, 0661
11
12
                 pieter.vantol@hoganlovells.com
13
                 M. SHANE JOHNSON, ESQ.
14
                 212. 918. 3775
15
                 shane. johnson@hoganlovells.com
16
17
        ALSO PRESENT:
18
19
        THOMAS E. HOMMEL, ESQ., Lehman Brothers
20
        EDDIE ARCHILLA, Videographer
21
22
23
24
25
```

INDEX OF EXAMINATION
Witness:
Dr. Thomas Marsoner
Examination:
By Ms. AlvarezPage 12
By Mr. Van TolPage 192
By Ms. AlvarezPage 202
Index of ExhibitsPage 5
Discovery Requests
By Ms. AlvarezPage 66
By Ms. AlvarezPage 115
By Ms. AlvarezPage 164
By Ms. AlvarezPage 165

Page 5 1 2 EXHIBITS 3 4 5 Single-page e-mail from Thomas Bernard to Vittorio Pignatti and others, dated Thursday, October 3, 2002, 6 7 Bates stamped LEH_0000415 8 Exhibit 241 9 Single-page e-mail from Denise Calus to Thomas 10 11 Bernard, dated Monday, October 7, 2002, Bates stamped 12 LEH 0000225 13 14 Exhibit 343 15 Single-page e-mail from Thomas Bernard to Vittorio 16 Pignatti and others, dated Tuesday, October 8, 2002, 17 Bates stamped LEH_0000412 18 19 20 Multipage document bearing the heading Lehman 21 Brothers, dated 13th February 2004, addressed to 22 Thomas Marsoner, and bearing no Bates stamps 23 24 25

1	
2	Exhibit 585
3	Five-page document entitled Declaration of Dr. Thomas
4	Marsoner in Support of the Motion of Dr. Thomas
5	Marsoner to Deem Proofs of Claim to be Timely Filed
6	by the Claims Bar Date, with cover page labeled
7	Exhibit B, and bearing no Bates stamps
8	
9	Exhibit 688
10	Multipage e-mail chain bearing at the top of the
11	first page an e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Thomas
12	Bernard, dated Thursday, December 1, 2005, and Bates
13	stamped LEH_0000214 through 217
14	
15	Exhibit 7104
16	Two-page e-mail chain bearing at the top of the first
17	page an e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Thomas
18	Bernard, dated December 1, 2005, and Bates stamped
19	LEH_0000201 and 202
20	
21	Exhibit 8107
22	Single-page e-mail from Vittorio to David Stonberg
23	and others, dated Thursday, May 24, 2007, and Bates
24	stamped LEH_0000203
25	

Page 7

1 2 3 Two-page e-mail chain bearing on the top of the first 4 page an e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Jeremy Isaacs, 5 dated Wednesday, July 4, 2007, and Bates stamped 6 Marsoner00000159 and 160 7 Exhibit 10117 8 9 Two-page e-mail chain bearing on the top of the first 10 page an e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Dan 11 Schwarzmann, dated Monday, December 3, 2012, and 12 Bates stamped Marsoner00000157 and 158 13 14 15 Multipage document entitled Consent Order, bearing 16 the hand-written date at the top of the page 19th 17 June, 2014, and Bates stamped Marsoner00000217 18 through 227 19 20 Exhibit 12 129 21 Multipage document entitled Lehman Brothers Europe 22 Limited - In Administration, Joint Administrators' 23 progress report for the period 23 September 2009 to 24 22 March 2010, dated 20 April 2010, and bearing no 25 Bates stamps

Page 8

1 2 3 Multipage document bearing on the first page an 4 e-mail from Tom Bernard to Thomas Marsoner, dated 5 December 12, 2014, and Bates stamped Marsoner00000032 6 through 41 7 8 9 Single-page e-mail from Tom Bernard to Thomas 10 Marsoner, dated February 3, 2015, with single-page 11 attachment. Bates stamped Marsoner00000042 and 43 12 13 14 Two-page e-mail chain bearing at the top of the first 15 page an e-mail from Christian Meissner to Thomas 16 Marsoner, dated January 28, 2015, with single-page 17 attachment, Bates stamped Marsoner000000624 through 18 626 19 20 21 Two-page letter from Vittorio Pignatti Morano to 22 Judge Chapman, United States Bankruptcy Court, 23 Southern District of New York, dated January 7, 2015, 24 and bearing no Bates stamps 25

1	
2	Exhibit 17167
3	Multipage e-mail chain bearing at the top of the
4	first page an e-mail from Vittorio Pignatti to Thomas
5	Marsoner, dated December 4, 2002, with multipage
6	attachment, Bates stamped Marsoner 00000008 through
7	31
8	
9	Exhibit 18174
10	Two-page letter from Vittorio Pignatti Morano to
11	Judge Chapman, United States Bankruptcy Court,
12	Southern District of New York, dated January 6, 2015,
13	Bates stamped Marsoner00000622 and 623
14	
15	Exhibit 19184
16	Single-page letter from Ruggero Magnoni to Judge
17	Chapman, United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern
18	District of New York, dated January 14, 2015, and
19	bearing no Bates stamp
20	
21	Exhibit 20186
22	Single-page e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Ruggero
23	Magnoni, dated January 14, 2015, with single-page
24	attachment, Bates stamped Marsoner00000071 and 721
25	

1	
2	Exhibit 21188
3	11-page document entitled Plan Administrators' First
4	Set of Document Requests to Dr. Thomas Marsoner
5	Pursuant to Rules 7026 and 7034 of the Federal Rules
6	of Bankruptcy Procedure, bearing no Bates stamps
7	
8	Exhibit 22195
9	Multipage document entitled Notice of Hearing on
10	Motion of Dr. Thomas Marsoner to Deem Proofs of Claim
11	to be Timely Filed by the Claims Bar Date, with
12	multiple attachments, and bearing no Bates stamps
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	MADOONED
	MARSONER
2	* * *
3	PROCEEDING
4	Tuesday, December 15, 2015
5	New York, New York
6	9:45 a.m.
7	* * *
8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is media unit
9	number one in the deposition of Thomas Marsoner
10	in the matter of In Re Lehman Brothers Holdings
11	Inc.
12	This deposition is being held at Hogan
13	Lovells, located at 875 Third Avenue, New York,
14	New York, on December 15, 2015, at approximately
15	9:45 a.m.
16	My name is Eddie Archilla. I am the
17	video specialist. The court reporter is Brad
18	Rainoff, in association with Gregory Edwards,
19	located at 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington,
20	D. C.
21	For the record, counsel please
22	introduce themselves.
23	MS. ALVAREZ: My name is Denise
24	Alvarez with Weil, Gotshal & Manges representing
25	Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. and Lehman

1	MARSONER
2	Commercial Paper Inc.
3	MR. HORWITZ: Maurice Horwitz, Weil
4	Gotshal & Manges, representing Lehman Brothers
5	Holdings Inc. and Lehman Commercial Paper Inc.
6	MS. MARCUS: Jacqueline Marcus, Weil,
7	Gotshal & Manges, representing Lehman Brothers
8	Holdings Inc. and Lehman Commercial Paper Inc.
9	MR. HOMMEL: Thomas Hommel,
10	representative of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc.
11	MR. VAN TOL: Pieter Van Tol from
12	Hogan Lovells representing Dr. Thomas Marsoner.
13	MR. JOHNSON: Shane Johnson from Hogan
14	Lovells representing Dr. Thomas Marsoner.
15	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Now would the court
16	reporter please swear in the witness.
17	DR. THOMAS MARSONER,
18	having been duly sworn, was examined and
19	testified as follows:
20	EXAMINATION
21	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
22	Q. Good morning, Mr. Marsoner.
23	I have a few instructions for you, but
24	before that, have you been deposed before?
25	A. Have I been deposed before? Yes, on

1	MARSONER
2	one occasion in the US, yes.
3	Q. Just once?
4	A. Just once in the US, yes.
5	Q. So I'm just going to remind you of
6	some a few basic instructions.
7	I'm going to ask questions and then
8	I'd like you to answer them. If you don't
9	understand a question, just let me know that you
10	didn't understand it and I will repeat it, I'll
11	clarify. If you answer a question, I'm going to
12	assume that you understood it.
13	Also, when answering questions, let's
14	answer verbally: "Yes," "no." You know,
15	don't sometimes we go: "Hm-hmm," "uh-huh,"
16	you know. The court reporter can't take that
17	down.
18	If at any point you want a break and
19	you need to use the restroom or you need to just
20	take a break, just let us know and we'll find a
21	good time to stop and break.
22	Did you understand those instructions?
23	A. I did. Thank you.
24	Q. Okay. Great.
25	Would you let's start with your

1	MARSONER
2	address. Please state your address for the
3	record?
4	A. My resident address is number 20 Earls
5	Terrace, London W8 6LP.
6	Q. How long have you lived there?
7	A. Since April 2002.
8	Q. April 2002.
9	Have you had any other addresses since
10	April 2002 or have you been in the same place?
11	A. Yes, I've always had an Austrian
12	address, known under UK tax law as my domicile,
13	and that address is Andreas-Hofer-Strasse No.
14	43, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria.
15	Q. Any other addresses?
16	A. No addresses where one could serve
17	anything on me.
18	Q. Okay. Any vacation addresses?
19	A. I have generally spent my vacations in
20	hotels, on boats, occasionally with friends or
21	relatives. But certainly no useful
22	correspondence addresses other than these two.
23	Q. Are there any other addresses that you
24	characterize any other way, any other any
25	other place where you have spent your time

whether it's vacation or business where it's not a hotel? MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form. You may answer. A. Sorry, I didn't really understand that question. O. Are there any other addresses where you have spent some time that is not a hotel or a vacation address? MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may answer. A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. O. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered address of 13 David Mews, London W1.		
MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form. You may answer. A. Sorry, I didn't really understand that question. Q. Are there any other addresses where you have spent some time that is not a hotel or a vacation address? MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may answer. A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	1	MARSONER
MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form. You may answer. A. Sorry, I didn't really understand that question. Q. Are there any other addresses where you have spent some time that is not a hotel or a vacation address? MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may answer. A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	2	whether it's vacation or business where it's not
A. Sorry, I didn't really understand that question. Q. Are there any other addresses where you have spent some time that is not a hotel or a vacation address? MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may answer. A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	3	a hotel?
A. Sorry, I didn't really understand that question. Q. Are there any other addresses where you have spent some time that is not a hotel or a vacation address? MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may answer. A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	4	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form. You
question. Q. Are there any other addresses where you have spent some time that is not a hotel or a vacation address? MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may answer. A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	5	may answer.
9 you have spent some time that is not a hotel or 10 a vacation address? 11 MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may 12 answer. 13 A. Okay, I think I've answered that 14 before. Certainly there have been boats. There 15 have been friends' houses. I have been in 16 family's houses. Occasionally I might have 17 rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. 18 So, yes, I have certainly spent time 19 in places other than those two good permanent 20 addresses of mine, but they are not addresses 21 where I would have ever taken delivery of 22 anything. 23 Q. Where are you currently employed? 24 A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	6	A. Sorry, I didn't really understand that
you have spent some time that is not a hotel or a vacation address? MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may answer. A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	7	question.
a vacation address? MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may answer. A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	8	Q. Are there any other addresses where
11 MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may 12 answer. 13 A. Okay, I think I've answered that 14 before. Certainly there have been boats. There 15 have been friends' houses. I have been in 16 family's houses. Occasionally I might have 17 rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. 18 So, yes, I have certainly spent time 19 in places other than those two good permanent 20 addresses of mine, but they are not addresses 21 where I would have ever taken delivery of 22 anything. 23 Q. Where are you currently employed? 24 A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	9	you have spent some time that is not a hotel or
A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	10	a vacation address?
A. Okay, I think I've answered that before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	11	MR. VAN TOL: Same objection. You may
before. Certainly there have been boats. There have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	12	answer.
have been friends' houses. I have been in family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	13	A. Okay, I think I've answered that
family's houses. Occasionally I might have rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	14	before. Certainly there have been boats. There
rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks. So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	15	have been friends' houses. I have been in
So, yes, I have certainly spent time in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	16	family's houses. Occasionally I might have
in places other than those two good permanent addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	17	rented a house for a week or a couple of weeks.
addresses of mine, but they are not addresses where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	18	So, yes, I have certainly spent time
where I would have ever taken delivery of anything. Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	19	in places other than those two good permanent
22 anything. 23 Q. Where are you currently employed? 24 A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	20	addresses of mine, but they are not addresses
Q. Where are you currently employed? A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	21	where I would have ever taken delivery of
A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered	22	anything.
	23	Q. Where are you currently employed?
25 address of 13 David Mews, London W1.	24	A. At M&M Capital Ltd. with a registered
	25	address of 13 David Mews, London W1.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. What's your position at the company?
3	A. I'm the chief executive of this small
4	M&A boutique.
5	Q. What are your responsibilities as
6	chief executive?
7	A. The company has one employed secretary
8	and has one chairman who lives in Italy. So
9	pretty much anything and everything that goes on
10	at the company is my responsibility.
11	Q. What's the name of the chairman?
12	A. The chairman is Ruggero Magnoni.
13	Q. What is his what are his
14	responsibilities at the company?
15	A. He chairs board meetings when we have
16	them roughly once a year. The way the setup
17	works is that we share expenditures, but we have
18	completely separate accounts for our revenues.
19	So transactions that I work on, my part of the
20	company is allocated the revenues, transactions
21	Ruggero is working on his part of the company is
22	allocated the revenues.
23	Q. How long have you been at M&M Capital?
24	A. Since I left Nomura, so that would
25	have been 2013.

Page	1	7
------	---	---

1	MARSONER
2	Q. What was your position at Nomura?
3	A. At Nomura I was vice chairman in
4	investment banking and the managing director.
5	Q. When did you start at Nomura?
6	A. I started at Nomura in June of 2009.
7	Q. Where did you work prior to June of
8	2009?
9	A. I was, from April 2001 until September
10	15, 2008, a senior advisor to Lehman Brothers,
11	self-employed senior advisor.
12	Q. 0kay.
13	A. But I did not advise anybody other
14	than Lehman Brothers during those years.
15	Q. How did you end up at Nomura?
16	A. After Lehman went bankrupt, the
17	European and the Asian operations of Lehman were
18	bought by Nomura and a couple of my old friends
19	at Lehman asked me whether I would be prepared
20	to come on board again full-time to help them
21	build things up in the new Nomura world.
22	Q. Who were those old friends at Lehman?
23	A. Primarily Christian Meissner and
24	Michael Bonacker.
25	Q. I'm sorry, what was the second name?

1	MARSONER
2	A. Bonacker, B-O-N-A-C-K-E-R, who
3	approached me, who had the original idea that it
4	would make sense for me to join them on a
5	full-time basis again.
6	Q. So Meissner, Christian Meissner was
7	working at Nomura
8	A. Yes.
9	Q as well?
10	And Michael Bonacker was as well?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. You testified that you were senior
13	advisor at Lehman Brothers from April 2001 to
14	September 15, 2008.
15	What were your responsibilities as
16	senior advisor?
17	A. They were relatively varied and
18	relatively wide. There was certainly a focus
19	geographically in areas where I was known to
20	have an expertise and speak the language,
21	specifically, of course, Austria, Germany,
22	Switzerland.
23	My last full-time job at Lehman had
24	been head of industry coverage, so all the
25	industry groups reported to me. Financial

1	MARSONER
2	institutions is my own specialty. I used to run
3	the financial institutions group, but a whole
4	number of other groups like consumer retail,
5	energy, telecom also reported to me.
6	And so I did have expertise in a whole
7	number of additional industries.
8	Q. Who did you report to?
9	A. Originally my contractual counter
10	party was Vittorio Pignatti through and
11	including the 2004 agreement, and that changed
12	when Pignatti changed jobs to Christian Meissner
13	from '06 to the end of Lehman.
14	Q. Do you know what Christian Meissner's
15	position was at Lehman?
16	A. At the time when he and I interacted
17	in that the contractual relationship, he was,
18	I think, co-head of European investment banking,
19	later became head.
20	Q. Other than Mr. Pignatti and Mr.
21	Meissner, did you work primarily for any other
22	individuals at Lehman?
23	A. If I may, I'd like to characterize
24	that I worked with other people.
25	Q. Okay.

1	MARSONER
2	A. It was a very collegial place, and
3	when there was an opportunity that I had either
4	identified and thought useful to pursue, or
5	sometimes when Lehman had an opportunity where
6	Lehman thought that my expertise would be
7	useful, we would form teams ad hoc and would
8	work together on those. There were a whole
9	number of generally senior Lehman investment
10	bankers that I worked with over the years.
11	Q. Can you identify a couple of them?
12	A. Well, certainly Vittorio Pignatti,
13	himself. In the years when he was my
14	contractual counterpart, by definition I did
15	nothing that wasn't coordinated with him. That
16	then later changed, and later that was Christian
17	Meissner.
18	But in the years we're talking about,
19	it was certainly Vittorio Pignatti who was my
20	direct interlocutor on essentially everything,
21	certainly worked closely with Ruggero Magnoni as
22	well. Always had a very high regard for him.
23	There were other professionals like
24	Jonathan Rouner that in those years I worked
25	quite a bit with. Certainly Michael Bonacker

1	MARSONER
2	who had the German brief. So he certainly
3	entered the picture relatively frequently. And
4	others. I could go for a long time.
5	Q. Where was what was Jonathan
6	Rouner's position at Lehman?
7	A. At the time he had an automotive M&A
8	brief, not for race cars but for general
9	automotive manufacturing. There was a specific
10	Canadian company that was a client of his where
11	I knew one of the senior board members who was
12	Austrian, actually several of them very well.
13	It was called Magna International, and Rouner
14	and I worked relatively closely on a number of
15	ideas for Magna International.
16	Q. Where was Rouner based?
17	A. He was US based.
18	Q. Did you work with we are going to
19	get into the details, but did you work with
20	Rouner on Formula One?
21	A. Not with Rouner, no.
22	Q. What position did Bonacker hold with
23	the company?
24	A. He was head of German investment
25	banking.
25	banking.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. So he was based in Europe?
3	A. He was based in Frankfurt.
4	Q. I want to backtrack a little and
5	understand what have you done to prepare for the
6	deposition today.
7	A. I spent my entire life since age ten
8	on the subject matter is the honest answer.
9	Have I spoken to these two gentlemen
10	yesterday? Of course I have.
11	Q. Okay. Have you spoken to anybody else
12	about this deposition other than your lawyers?
13	A. No.
14	Q. I just want to confirm, have you
15	spoken to Pignatti?
16	A. After Pignatti's deposition I thanked
17	him for having taken the time.
18	Q. Did you ask Pignatti about the
19	deposition, what happened at his deposition?
20	A. No. No, I have read it.
21	Q. What about Magnoni, when is the last
22	time
23	A. Exactly the same thing. After his
24	deposition I thanked him for it. I read it. No
25	further details were discussed with either.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Have you discussed this matter with
3	Tom Bernard?
4	A. Not in a very long time, not until
5	just before he sent the letter that he kindly
6	sent.
7	Q. Have you spoken since he sent the
8	letter?
9	A. No, I have not spoken to Tom Bernard
10	since he sent the letter.
11	Q. What about Christian Meissner, have
12	you discussed this matter with him?
13	A. I have discussed this matter with him
14	once when I got the e-mail that you recently
15	quoted from Peter Sherratt in which Peter
16	claimed that Christian Meissner agreed that I
17	had no claim. I was on the phone to Christian
18	the next day and asked him why he would say
19	that, to which he said: I didn't, I told him it
20	was before my time.
21	Q. Did Christian Meissner say anything
22	else than: That was before my time?
23	A. He told me in that conversation that
24	he had told him you are taking an in-house
25	lawyer along, there was a Linklaters person, it

1	MARSONER
2	was a conference recall, and he Christian
3	told me that he told them he had nothing to add
4	on the Marsoner F1 matter because it was before
5	his time.
6	I then, for completeness sake, in
7	preparation of the US proceedings, I did contact
8	him again and asked Christian whether he would
9	be prepared to write a letter along the lines of
10	Marsoner F1 was before my time, and he responded
11	to that that the little draft I had prepared for
12	him Marsoner was before my time was
13	perfectly okay.
14	He replied in German to that, so he
15	had no problems with that text, but would I
16	please understand he now is head of global
17	corporate and investment banking at Bank of
18	America, Merrill Lynch. Huge job. Last
19	distraction he needs is to be deposed, God
20	forbid, publicly portrayed as involved in
21	litigation concerning Lehman. And I obviously
22	respected his wish not to be bothered.
23	Q. Okay. Have you spoken to him about
24	this matter since then?
25	A. No.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Have you spoken to Peter Sherratt
3	about this matter?
4	A. I attended, as you will recall, his
5	deposition. My communication with him
6	beforehand you have, and on the way out
7	exchanged one or two civilized words.
8	Q. What about any phone calls with Peter
9	Sherratt?
10	A. No.
11	Q. Have you discussed this matter with
12	Jeremy Isaacs?
13	A. I once went to see Jeremy around this.
14	This was, I believe, still around the UK
15	proceedings when I had come across my e-mail to
16	Jeremy Isaacs thanking him for the coffee and
17	telling him that the most significant thing I
18	had done for him was F1.
19	So I thought that I'd go see him with
20	my little evidence book, told him my story. He
21	hummed, you hawed, he told me he would take a
22	look at the book and I have never heard from him
23	since. And I respected his request for privacy
24	as well.
25	Q. Had you filed a claim in the UK

Page 26

MARSONER 1 2 proceedings by that point? 3 Α. Honestly I do not recall whether it 4 was before or after. I would assume that I had 5 gone to see him before I filed the UK claim but that I'm not sure about. 6 7 0kav. Did Jeremy Isaacs know that you 8 expected to be paid by Lehman Brothers Europe at 9 that time? 10 You have the e-mail. With that e-mail A. 11 it was my full intention to prepare the ground 12 for a later claim. I prepared that ground not only with him but also with Bonacker and also 13 14 with Dick Fuld in August of '08, but that's all 15 I did. It was well understood, it's 16 17 understanding, by many at Lehman at that time 18 that I was going to make a claim around that. 19 Q. It was well understood by Jeremy Isaacs? 20 21 A. It was well understood by a whole 22 number of people at Lehman that I would make a 23 claim. That is why I attached to my thank you 24 e-mail to Jeremy Isaacs what I think is the 25 salient exchange with Tom Bernard.

MARSONER Q. Did Jeremy Isaacs know that you were going to assert a claim against Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. or Lehman Commercial Paper Inc.? A. The way Lehman worked, the way the living Lehman worked, individual legal entities were not considered material. He certainly understood that I was going to make a claim against Lehman. Q. At that point you had informed him that you were asserting a claim in the UK
going to assert a claim against Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. or Lehman Commercial Paper Inc.? A. The way Lehman worked, the way the living Lehman worked, individual legal entities were not considered material. He certainly understood that I was going to make a claim against Lehman. Q. At that point you had informed him that you were asserting a claim in the UK
Holdings Inc. or Lehman Commercial Paper Inc.? A. The way Lehman worked, the way the living Lehman worked, individual legal entities were not considered material. He certainly understood that I was going to make a claim against Lehman. Q. At that point you had informed him that you were asserting a claim in the UK
A. The way Lehman worked, the way the living Lehman worked, individual legal entities were not considered material. He certainly understood that I was going to make a claim against Lehman. Q. At that point you had informed him that you were asserting a claim in the UK
6 living Lehman worked, individual legal entities 7 were not considered material. He certainly 8 understood that I was going to make a claim 9 against Lehman. 10 Q. At that point you had informed him 11 that you were asserting a claim in the UK
7 were not considered material. He certainly 8 understood that I was going to make a claim 9 against Lehman. 10 Q. At that point you had informed him 11 that you were asserting a claim in the UK
8 understood that I was going to make a claim 9 against Lehman. 10 Q. At that point you had informed him 11 that you were asserting a claim in the UK
9 against Lehman. 10 Q. At that point you had informed him 11 that you were asserting a claim in the UK
10 Q. At that point you had informed him 11 that you were asserting a claim in the UK
11 that you were asserting a claim in the UK
12 proceedings, correct?
13 MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form, lack
14 of foundation.
15 A. I told you, I'm sorry, I do not have
16 that time line clear in my head. I do not know
17 whether, when I went to see Jeremy with my
18 little evidence book, whether I had already
19 filed the UK proceedings or I had not. I
20 suspect I had not because, as I think about it,
21 it was just an evidence book.
22 I'm not I'm not sure about the
23 timeline.
24 Q. Okay.
25 A. But we can actually look it up because

1	MARSONER
2	I think I have one copy of my UK evidence book,
3	and if it includes the claim then it was after.
4	I think it does not but I'm not certain.
5	Q. We'll go through this is just
6	introduction, but we'll go through e-mails and
7	documents that could refresh your recollection.
8	A. Sure.
9	Q. Had you discussed this matter with
10	Steve Hannan?
11	A. I do not know him.
12	Q. Is there anyone else that I haven't
13	covered with whom you've discussed this matter
14	other than your attorneys?
15	A. I think you've I certainly can't
16	remember anybody right now.
17	Q. Did you review any documents to
18	prepare for this deposition?
19	A. I certainly reread the US claim and
20	its attachments as well as the letters that were
21	written in support of my claim.
22	Q. Did you review any other documents to
23	prepare for this deposition?
24	MR. VAN TOL: Objection. That's a yes
25	or no answer.

1	MARSONER
2	A. Yes, I did flip through the old UK
3	evidence book, the one that I showed Mr. Isaacs.
4	Q. What other documents did you review to
5	prepare for this deposition?
6	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
7	You haven't established foundation for
8	asking which particular documents he looked at.
9	Q. You can answer.
10	A. I do not remember
11	MR. VAN TOL: Don't
12	THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.
13	MR. VAN TOL: That's privileged until
14	they establish foundation.
15	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
16	Q. Did you review any other documents to
17	prepare for this deposition?
18	MR. VAN TOL: Yes or no, please.
19	Answer only yes or no, please.
20	A. Did I review documents to prepare for
21	this deposition? The answer is yes.
22	Q. What other documents did you review?
23	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
24	To the extent you are asking for the
25	particular documents, you haven't established a

1 MARSONER 2 foundation yet. That's privileged information. 3 MS. ALVAREZ: To the extent he 4 reviewed documents in preparation for this 5 deposition, we are entitled to know what he 6 reviewed. 7 MR. VAN TOL: That's correct, if you 8 can establish that it refreshed his 9 recollection. That's the test. You haven't 10 established that. 11 BY MS. ALVAREZ:
3 MS. ALVAREZ: To the extent he 4 reviewed documents in preparation for this 5 deposition, we are entitled to know what he 6 reviewed. 7 MR. VAN TOL: That's correct, if you 8 can establish that it refreshed his 9 recollection. That's the test. You haven't 10 established that.
4 reviewed documents in preparation for this 5 deposition, we are entitled to know what he 6 reviewed. 7 MR. VAN TOL: That's correct, if you 8 can establish that it refreshed his 9 recollection. That's the test. You haven't 10 established that.
deposition, we are entitled to know what he reviewed. MR. VAN TOL: That's correct, if you can establish that it refreshed his recollection. That's the test. You haven't established that.
6 reviewed. 7 MR. VAN TOL: That's correct, if you 8 can establish that it refreshed his 9 recollection. That's the test. You haven't 10 established that.
7 MR. VAN TOL: That's correct, if you 8 can establish that it refreshed his 9 recollection. That's the test. You haven't 10 established that.
8 can establish that it refreshed his 9 recollection. That's the test. You haven't 10 established that.
9 recollection. That's the test. You haven't 10 established that.
10 established that.
11 BY MS. ALVAREZ:
12 Q. Do you remember reviewing documents in
13 preparation for this deposition?
14 A. I just told you what documents I had
15 reviewed. I remember reviewing those.
16 Q. Okay. Are there any other documents
17 you remember reviewing?
18 A. I do not remember any other documents.
19 Q. Let's talk a little bit about Formula
20 One.
21 Please tell us how you came to work
22 on start from the beginning how you came
to work on Lehman's Formula One investment?
A. The origin of the Lehman Formula One
25 contact was when Ruggero Magnoni, Johann Ruppert

1	MARSONER
2	and I went, at my suggestion, to the Monte Carlo
3	Grand Prix in 1998. I was still a full time
4	employee of Lehman at the time. This was the
5	time when the various Bernie Ecclestone
6	stratagems first became public.
7	So I suggested to a number of the
8	senior people at Lehman that this was likely
9	going to grow into a business opportunity for
10	Lehman. Ruggero is a close friend of Johann
11	Ruppert. Johann Ruppert owned a company called
12	Rothman at the time. Rothman sponsored the
13	Williams team, and Johann Ruppert and Ruggero
14	Magnoni had long planned to attend a Grand Prix
15	together, so we went there together which is
16	when Ruggero first met Bernie Ecclestone. I had
17	met Bernie before. And that is the moment when
18	it all started.
19	Q. How did that moment lead to Lehman's
20	investment in Formula One?
21	A. There were a whole number of different
22	transactions contemplated in various ways.
23	Ultimately Lehman financed Leo Kirch, the TV
24	rights entrepreneur and sports rights
25	entrepreneur, in his acquisition of 75 percent

1 2 3	MARSONER of the call it the Bernie Ecclestone company.
	of the call it the Bornia Faclastone company
3	of the carrie the bernie Lecrestone company.
	Lehman underwrote \$300 million of the
4	\$1.6 billion loan. JPMorgan underwrote the
5	other 300, and Bayerische Landesbank, the house
6	bank of Mr. Kirch, underwrote a billion.
7	Relatively soon after that loan was
8	given, Mr. Kirch's business went bankrupt and
9	Lehman managed to enforce the collateral and
10	took delivery at the time of the 17 percent
11	stake in Formula One. This is about 2002.
12	Q. What was your role in that financing
13	to Kirch?
14	A. Luckily for me, none, for the simple
15	reason that I had been asked what I thought of
16	Mr. Kirch and I truthfully responded that all my
17	German banking clients and friends had a very
18	low opinion of Mr. Kirch.
19	So I had no involvement whatsoever in
20	the loan itself, which is probably one of the
21	reasons why, when the loan had gone belly up, I
22	got the call, in that case it was Pignatti, who
23	used the words: Thomas, we're thinking about
24	intensifying our relationship with you again.
25	I had done as an advisor already, I

1	MARSONER	
2	had done one or two things that they liked. And	
3	so Pignatti called me in and told me that they	
4	had the idea that they needed somebody who knew	
5	the space, who didn't scare easily, to help them	
6	and JPMorgan in their dealings with Bernie	
7	Ecclestone who they found incredibly difficult	
8	to work with.	
9	Q. Did Pignatti explain to you how long	
10	they would need your assistance?	
11	A. That was planned to be several years.	
12	Essentially the plan was to help them get as	
13	much money out of the stake they had gotten into	
14	involuntarily as I could, and that was going to,	
15	obviously visible at the time, be a multiyear	
16	project.	
17	Q. At this time were payment terms	
18	discussed for your assistance?	
19	A. That did not quite happen at that time	
20	because the first thing that needed to be	
21	discussed was whether JPMorgan would share the	
22	view of the Lehman people that I would be useful	
23	in this context.	
24	So this was an in principle	
25	discussion. Obviously it was not going to be a	

1	MARSONER
2	pro bono assignment but a serious assignment,
3	also a time commitment, so exposure.
4	Then I went to see a few gentlemen at
5	JPMorgan, Rick Gildea particularly comes to
6	mind, with whom I had from my point of view
7	perfectly decent discussions.
8	As you see from the e-mails I wrote at
9	the time, my own sort of concern was that more
10	than one of them asked me whether I was not too
11	close to Lehman to be able to represent both US
12	houses in this case which was which in truth
13	was not a completely stupid concern to have.
14	But other than that, they were very very,
15	very friendly discussions.
16	Next I heard was that Pignatti again
17	called me into his office and told me that
18	JPMorgan had decided not to avail themselves of
19	my services but to put their own "Rolls Royce
20	team" on to this assignment and would I please
21	help Lehman.
22	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay. I want to look at
23	a few documents from that time period. We can
24	take a look at the first exhibit. It's Lehman
25	415 is the Bates stamp.
25	415 is the Bates stamp.

1	MARSONER
2	(Marsoner Exhibit 1, Single-page
3	e-mail from Thomas Bernard to Vittorio Pignatti
4	and others, dated Thursday, October 3, 2002,
5	Bates stamped LEH_0000415, marked for
6	identification)
7	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
8	Q. Dr. Marsoner, I would like you to look
9	at what's been marked Exhibit 1. It is an
10	e-mail from Thomas Bernard to Vittorio Pignatti,
11	Peter Sherratt, Steve Hannan, and it's dated
12	October 3rd, 2002.
13	Do you see that?
14	A. Hm-hmm.
15	Q. We talked a little bit about these
16	individuals, but let's clarify a little.
17	Who is Tom Bernard?
18	A. Tom Bernard I have known for a long
19	time. He was a teacher in my Salomon training
20	class in 1985 when Michael Lewis called him the
21	human piranha. So he is still famous for that.
22	Actually loves that.
23	Q. What was his role in F1?
24	A. He was originally or at the time the
25	head of our global credit businesses, and when

1	MARSONER
2	the Kirch Ioan became a workout situation, Dick
3	Fuld, I think through Jeff Vanderbeek, asked Tom
4	Bernard to run the workout.
5	Q. Where was he based?
6	A. New York. New York, if not Aspen,
7	Colorado. Certainly US-based.
8	Q. What was we talked a little about
9	Pignatti. What was his title, do you know?
10	A. He was at the time head of European
11	M&A.
12	Q. What was his we've already talked
13	about his role in F1, we'll get into more detail
14	in a minute.
15	And Peter Sherratt, who was he?
16	A. He was counsel, he was in-house
17	counsel to Lehman in Europe.
18	Q. What was his role in F1?
19	A. He was the lawyer. There were the
20	original corporate governance was that Bernie
21	Ecclestone ran F1 with his 25 percent against 75
22	percent minorities of the three banks.
23	So the very first thing they had to do
24	him was sue him in Jersey which Peter was
25	involved in and Vittorio to get something

MARSONER
approaching normal governance into the F1
situation. Peter was critical around all that.
Q. I know you said you didn't know Steve
Hannan, but do you know what his role was in F1?
A. I have since learned, but this is
relatively recent, that he was the first guy
that Lehman hired to become a professional
workout person of bad loans.
Lehman wasn't much in the lending
business then, so it didn't have many bad loans.
And when they started accumulating bad loans,
apparently they hired Steve Hannan to help them
work those loans out.
Q. Do you know where Steve Hannon was
based?
A. New York, I believe, but as I said I
do not believe I've ever met him.
Q. Let's look at the text of this e-mail.
Here Tom Bernard is actually
forwarding an e-mail originally sent by Vittorio
Pignatti on October 3rd, 2002, and Pignatti
stated in the e-mail: Spoke with Thomas
Marsoner who is in principle interested and
ready to hear more. He is available in person

Page	38
------	----

1	MARSONER
2	on Monday afternoon in London. Let me know how
3	you want to proceed.
4	Now, I recognize you are not copied on
5	this e-mail chain, but do you know what
6	conversation Pignatti was referring to?
7	A. Yeah, that was the one when he called
8	me in and said: We would like to intensify the
9	relationship, would you be able to help us on
10	F1?
11	Q. Was this an in-person conversation?
12	A. This was an in-person conversation,
13	yes.
14	Q. Was anyone anyone else there?
15	A. No.
16	Q. At this point I believe you testified
17	compensation terms weren't discussed?
18	A. No.
19	Q. Then this e-mail also refers to a
20	meeting possibly Monday afternoon in London.
21	Did that meeting take place?
22	A. I only recall telephoning
23	conversations with Tom Bernard at the time.
24	Q. Was anyone else on the phone other
25	than Tom Bernard?

Page 39

1	MARSONER
2	A. The conversations that I remember
3	having with Tom were always just Tom and I.
4	Q. What was discussed with Tom?
5	A. It was essentially him satisfying
6	himself that what he had heard from Pignatti,
7	which is Marsoner knows the space, was true. So
8	I gave him the lay of the land in F1 as I saw it
9	at the time.
10	Q. At this point was compensation
11	discussed?
12	A. Again, there was no reason to discuss
13	compensation. I had my relationship with
14	Lehman, that was a paid advisory relationship,
15	and this was not a situation where one would
16	need to discuss compensation.
17	Q. When you say you had a paid advisory
18	relationship with Lehman, are you referring to
19	the consultancy agreements?
20	A. Yes, of course.
21	Q. None of those consultancy
22	agreements
23	MR. VAN TOL: I think
24	A. Sorry, may I please finish?
25	Q. Did I cut you off? I'm sorry, go

1	MARSONER
2	ahead.
3	A. Yes, of course I refer to the
4	consultancy agreements, but what I really refer
5	to is the whole seven-year period during which I
6	worked seamlessly as a senior advisor to Lehman.
7	Since those were seven years and there
8	were only five consultancy agreements that only
9	ever had the span of one year, there were a
10	whole number of periods in which technically the
11	formal consultancy agreement was not in force.
12	It had expired or whatever.
13	Nothing changed in my dealings with
14	Lehman during the period when those did not
15	exist. The way it worked was with the rules of
16	the old agreement were carried forward until
17	such time as a new agreement was signed.
18	So this was a seamless seven-year
19	advisory relationship on a for-fees basis.
20	Q. Those consultancy agreements
21	identified which transactions you would be
22	assisting Lehman with, correct?
23	A. They identified some but by far not
24	all.
25	Q. We're going to go through those

1	MARSONER
2	consultancy agreements as well, and when we go
3	through them I'd like to go through what
4	transactions are not covered by those
5	agreements.
6	MS. ALVAREZ: So let's take a look at
7	what we'll mark as Exhibit 2. What we are
8	marking as Exhibit 2 is labeled Lehman 225 on
9	the bottom right-hand corner.
10	If you take a look at it, it is an
11	e-mail from Denise Callas to Tom Bernard dated
12	October 7, 2002, and the subject line reads:
13	Conference call between yourself, Peter Sherratt
14	and Thomas Marsoner.
15	(Marsoner Exhibit 2, Single-page
16	e-mail from Denise Calus to Thomas Bernard,
17	dated Monday, October 7, 2002, Bates stamped
18	LEH_0000225, marked for identification)
19	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
20	Q. Who is Denise Callas?
21	A. I do not know her. I assume reading
22	the e-mail she is the assistant to Peter
23	Sherratt. Do not remember ever meeting her.
24	Q. Now, the text of the e-mail reads:
25	Tom, Peter has asked me to organize the above

1	MARSONER
2	conference call. Thomas Marsoner is only
3	available this afternoon London time and no
4	other time this week. Would you have any time
5	available today?
6	Then he just he goes through trying
7	to schedule this call.
8	Do you know what this call was about?
9	A. I cannot pinpoint what this call
10	exactly was about. I assume from the date that
11	it was the follow-on to the first one.
12	My recollection before I went to see
13	the JPMorgan people, I had one relatively
14	detailed telephone conversation with Tom
15	Bernard. I do not remember Peter Sherratt
16	having been on that call, but I can't rule it
17	out either.
18	Q. Is this the call that you described
19	for me a few minutes ago?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Did you have any other calls with Tom
22	Bernard?
23	A. No, there was one detailed one and
24	then, as I recall it, then I went to see the
25	JPMorgan people.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Okay.
3	MS. ALVAREZ: So let's mark the next
4	exhibit.
5	This e-mail is Bates stamped Lehman
6	412. This exhibit, Exhibit 3, is marked Lehman
7	412 on the bottom right-hand side. It is an
8	e-mail from Tom Bernard dated October 8th, 2002,
9	and it is to Vittorio Pignatti, Peter Sherratt
10	and Steve Hannan.
11	(Marsoner Exhibit 3, Single-page
12	e-mail from Thomas Bernard to Vittorio Pignatti
13	and others, dated Tuesday, October 8, 2002,
14	Bates stamped LEH_0000412, marked for
15	identification)
16	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
17	Q. Now, you are not copied on this
18	e-mail, Dr. Marsoner. Let's look at the text.
19	The first line reads: Spoke to Jeff
20	V. about retaining Marsoner. With numerous
21	caveats, told him we were thinking 200 million
22	salary plus a success fee of 250 million plus 2
23	percent of recovery above 225 million.
24	Do you see that?
25	A. I see that. I would have accepted

1	MARSONER
2	that in a flash.
3	MR. VAN TOL: I would, too.
4	A. It's 200,000.
5	Q. Oh, it's 200,000. Okay.
6	Who is Jeff V., do you know?
7	A. Jeff Vanderbeek.
8	Q. Who is Jeff Vanderbeek?
9	A. It could have been chief of staff to
10	Dick Fuld or something like that, very senior
11	role at corporate in New York, or could have
12	been head of global fixed income. There were
13	others more qualified than me in the room.
14	Q. Was this offer ever made to you, the
15	200,000 salary?
16	A. No, the first time I saw this was when
17	I saw this e-mail in discovery.
18	Q. Were any compensation terms discussed
19	with you with regard to the possible joint
20	retention by JPMorgan at Lehman Brothers?
21	A. No.
22	MR. VAN TOL: Ms. Alvarez, we have
23	been going about 55 minutes, so at a convenient
24	time it would be great to have a break.
25	MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah, this would

MARSONER actually be okay to take a break now. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 10:37 a.m. and we are going off the record. (Recess) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins media unit number two. The time is 10:49 a.m. and we are back on the record. MS. ALVAREZ: Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk to you a little bit more about your role in
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 10:37 a.m. and we are going off the record. (Recess) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins media unit number two. The time is 10:49 a.m. and we are back on the record. MS. ALVAREZ: Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk
a.m. and we are going off the record. (Recess) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins media unit number two. The time is 10:49 a.m. and we are back on the record. MS. ALVAREZ: Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk
(Recess) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins media unit number two. The time is 10:49 a.m. and we are back on the record. MS. ALVAREZ: Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins media unit number two. The time is 10:49 a.m. and we are back on the record. MS. ALVAREZ: Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk
unit number two. The time is 10:49 a.m. and we are back on the record. MS. ALVAREZ: Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk
are back on the record. MS. ALVAREZ: Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk
MS. ALVAREZ: Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk
Q. Okay, Dr. Marsoner. I'd like to talk
to you a little bit more about your role in
Lehman's Formula One investment.
I want to divide it up by time period.
So between before 2005, between 2002 and
2004, what was your role on Formula One for
Lehman?
A. At Vittorio Pignatti's request, I
watched the space very carefully, and when I saw
either a pitfall for Lehman or an opportunity, I
would either call Pignatti or send him an
e-mail. I think some thirty of those e-mails
have been dug out that I have sent to him,
sometimes copying Sherratt over the time period
between JPMorgan passing on my help and the

1	MARSONER
2	Bernard. So I was, in my self-perception,
3	working on this very regularly.
4	Q. How often would you speak to Pignatti
5	about Formula One?
6	A. Depends on depends on whether there
7	was anything urgent going on. When there was a
8	development that looked like it was either an
9	opportunity or a threat, could have been, you
10	know, on a weekly basis. During quiet periods I
11	might not have spoken to him about it for
12	months.
13	Q. You mentioned that you copied Peter
14	Sherratt on some of the e-mails.
15	A. Yeah.
16	Q. Did you speak to Peter Sherratt about
17	Formula One?
18	A. If at all, then very little. The
19	reason he was, my perception, involved in those
20	years is because there were so many little legal
21	pitfalls in the governance structure of F1. So
22	that for the banks just to go somewhere close to
23	exercising the 75 percent voting power that they
24	had, required very heavy duty legal lifting, and
25	there Sherratt was very involved and very good

1	MARSONER
2	and very successful.
3	Q. Other than Pignatti and Sherratt, were
4	you in touch with anyone else at Lehman
5	regarding Formula One during this time period?
6	A. Yes, Magnoni to a much lesser degree.
7	Q. Anyone else?
8	A. No. I certainly can't recall anybody
9	else at this stage.
10	Q. Did you participate in any meetings
11	regarding Formula One during this time period?
12	A. Beyond the group that I mentioned,
13	which was primarily Pignatti and Magnoni with
14	whom I would meet periodically, and certainly in
15	those years I cannot recall a single meeting
16	with any of them where Formula One did not come
17	up, also because they had things to share with
18	me that I wasn't so privy to. The whole Ferrari
19	relationship was one where they were closer than
20	I was. So we certainly compared notes.
21	Q. Now, Pignatti was based in Europe,
22	correct?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. So was Magnoni?
25	A. Yes.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. And Peter Sherratt was based in
3	Europe?
4	A. Yes. But Magnoni and Pignatti were
5	also officers of LBHI.
6	Q. How do you know that?
7	A. Because I read it in the annual report
8	of LBHI, and because they were very proud of
9	those titles.
10	Q. During this time period was there a
11	dedicated F1 team at Lehman?
12	A. I do not know exactly at what point in
13	time the Patricks, who were relatively junior
14	bankers at the time, that is, Patrick
15	Schmitz-Morkramer and Patrick Bierbaum, got
16	involved. Since I now have seen that it was
17	actually Patrick Bierbaum who wrote the job
18	description of mine that they were submitting to
19	JPMorgan, I assume that they were involved at
20	the time.
21	I certainly think highly of them, and
22	I have certainly interacted with Patrick,
23	Schmitz-Morkramer, that is, on a number of
24	issues, but their role was a data gathering and
25	data analysis role. Theirs was not a strategic

1	MARSONER
2	role.
3	Q. Do you know where Patrick Bierbaum was
4	based?
5	A. In London, I believe, if not in
6	Frankfurt. I do not know. With him I did not
7	interact. Schmitz-Morkramer was originally in
8	London and then in Frankfurt.
9	Q. Okay. So now let's take us to the
10	2005 time period.
11	What was your role in F1 from 2005
12	forward?
13	A. In 2005 after a number of not so happy
14	occurrences for the banks, including, which is
15	important here, a complete break down in their
16	discussions with both the teams and Ecclestone
17	in '04, there certainly surfaced first the rumor
18	and then the announcement that CVC had reached
19	agreement with Bayerische Landesbank to buy
20	Bayerische Landesbank's stake in F1.
21	That was huge news because the whole
22	crux of the issue was the longevity of the
23	franchise. Everybody always knew that F1 was
24	highly profitable year in, year out, but the big
25	risk that everybody saw was that this party

1	MARSONER	
2	could end at any year end, really. And when I	
3	picked up that CVC was going to buy, I picked up	
4	at the same time through my Austrian racing	
5	connections that Ron Dennis of McLaren was fully	
6	supportive of the CVC deal.	
7	That was a financially, strategically	
8	truly huge development, as Tom Bernard put it,	
9	because if you looked at the world championships	
10	for the 20 years leading up to 2005, about	
11	two-thirds of them were either Ferrari victories	
12	or McLaren victories. So Ferrari versus McLaren	
13	was the race.	
14	In the Ecclestone years, when	
15	Ecclestone was essentially fighting the banks	
16	from '02 to '05 after the breakdown in '04,	
17	Ecclestone essentially bought off Ferrari. He	
18	knew Ferrari was the team. Without Ferrari,	
19	very difficult to run a championship. He	
20	essentially cut them an annual check for \$50	
21	million, which remained secret at the time, but	
22	with that cash payment he broke Ferrari out of	
23	the GPWC consortium. So the senior team in the	
24	GPWC consortium was McLaren.	
25	The moment it became clear that	

1	MARSONER
2	McLaren was supportive of CVC, the big value
3	impact in Formula One had gone away
4	automatically. What used to be what used to
5	be an annual circus had suddenly become a
6	multiyear circus with corresponding tremendous
7	uplift in value.
8	That was my I was the first to call
9	that, certainly at Lehman, and that was my major
10	contribution.
11	Q. How did you learn that McLaren was
12	supportive of CVC?
13	A. Originally from the Austrian circles.
14	More specifically it was something like Ron
15	Dennis telling Nicky Lauder telling my uncle
16	telling me. That was essentially my my
17	unique access to nonpublic information.
18	In addition to that, through my
19	watching brief on this for a number of years, I
20	knew fairly precisely which of the racing
21	journalists in which papers had good information
22	and which ones had bad information. So I could
23	triangulate quite well.
24	Q. One thing you said a couple minutes
25	ago was that F1 was a big risk that it was a

1	MARSONER
2	big risk and everyone saw it as a big risk?
3	A. Yeah, up to that moment, yes.
4	Q. I'm just focusing on the word
5	"everyone" because I want to understand who are
6	you referring to when you said everyone.
7	A. Everybody involved with an idea of
8	what was going on. Goldman Sachs were advising
9	GPWC. Purely technically they had the
10	wherewithal and the financial resources to set
11	up a separate series. Separate series happened
12	all the time in motor sport. In the US it is
13	split between Indy and NASCAR. In boxing there
14	are competing series. It is very useful and
15	very value accretive for a global sport to be
16	essentially a monopoly, and the risk of split is
17	very real at all times. And in those years, the
18	risk of split for F1 was very, very real.
19	Q. You mentioned earlier that Tom Bernard
20	was heading out heading up the workout team
21	at Lehman?
22	A. Yeah.
23	Q. Who else was on that team?
24	A. My perception was that Tom Bernard was
25	the man.

1	MADCONED
1	MARSONER
2	Q. Did you know if there was anyone else
3	on that team?
4	A. I have since, you know, I have since
5	heard, of course, of Steve Hannan who I did not
6	know at the time. I certainly knew that Peter
7	Sherratt was involved as a lawyer. And in my
8	perception, certainly through the end of my
9	discussions with Bernard in '05, Vittorio
10	Pignatti was also fully involved.
11	Q. And Pignatti was your main contact?
12	A. Pignatti was the main contact, yes.
13	Q. Did you ever communicate with Tom
14	Bernard, other than the telephone calls we
15	talked about earlier, did you ever communicate
16	with Tom Bernard separately from Pignatti?
17	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
18	It's vague as to time.
19	Q. I'm really talking about this 2005
20	forward time period.
21	A. We all have the salient e-mail
22	exchange which starts me briefing Pignatti,
23	copying Sherratt. And when I then realized that
24	I really had critical, urgent, huge, as Bernard
25	calls it, information, I sent the e-mail

Page 54

MARSONER 1 2 directly to Bernard. And if you go through that 3 exchange you'll see that at the end he asks me 4 for my number again, and we then spoke on the 5 phone a couple of times also. What did you discuss on the phone? 6 7 Very much the detail to where I -- how A. 8 certain was I of my sources, which by then was a 9 no-brainer because by then the McLaren statement 10 had become public, how the risk analysis would 11 If you look at the e-mail you'll see that 12 Tom Bernard found the spelling of McLaren 13 somewhat challenging. 14 If you'll allow me, it's a little bit 15 like putting Europeans in charge of a baseball Americans and F1 is not a natural 16 organization. 17 If you look at my e-mail with Tom Bernard, 18 for example, it asked me why would CVC be so 19 welcome. My response was that they have done 20 such a good job running Moto GP, the motorbike 21 racing series. So he asked me whether Mercedes 22 was racing motorbikes. 23 So between his spelling of McLaren and 24 whether Mercedes was a motorbike manufacturer, 25 there was a relatively large amount of factual

Page	55
------	----

1	MARSONER
2	F1 racing knowledge that he at that time had a
3	curiosity for where I was in a position to fill
4	the gaps in his knowledge.
5	So it was very much a, you know, a
6	an invited significant knowledge and knowhow
7	transfer from me to him. And he reacted very
8	positively. He was very, very grateful and, as
9	he also wrote, he accepted my advice.
10	Q. When you spoke to him on the phone,
11	did he tell you whether Lehman had decided to
12	sell its stake in F1?
13	A. The words he mentioned to me that
14	stuck in my mind are words like: Thank you
15	very, very much, that's very, very, very useful,
16	inclined to follow your advice but we are still
17	in discovery mode.
18	He did not have the offer from CVC at
19	that time.
20	Q. You said he said Lehman was still in
21	discovery mode?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. So they were deciding they were
24	still considering what to do?
25	A. They were absolutely going to make

1	MARSONER
2	their ultimate decision once the once the bid
3	was on the table which, of course, it wasn't
4	when I briefed him.
5	Q. Did Bernard tell you whether anyone at
6	Lehman was advising Lehman to sell its stake in
7	F1?
8	A. I do not know if it was Bernard, but I
9	was told at the time that the CVC coverage
10	banker, trying to do CVC a favor, was very much
11	in favor of selling to CVC. CVC was a very
12	important client of the firm, so doing CVC a
13	favor was certainly something that was popular
14	with those who made their living off of the CVC
15	relationship.
16	Q. Who told you that?
17	A. I believe it was Pignatti but I'm not
18	sure.
19	Q. Do you know if Pignatti was advising
20	Lehman to sell its stake?
21	A. Pignatti was fully aligned with me.
22	Q. Do you know whether Pignatti ever
23	informed anyone at Lehman that they should
24	that it was his opinion that Lehman
25	A. I'd be surprised if he had been.

1	MARSONER
2	Q should sell it's stake?
3	You'd be very surprised I'm sorry?
4	A. I would be very surprised if Pignatti
5	had advised Lehman to sell. The the
6	financial impact of this coordination with
7	McLaren was huge. You have a one or two-year
8	cash flow expectation of significant cash flows
9	that suddenly becomes, given that they are now
10	all in on it, a certainly seven, but probably 14
11	or 21-year proposition.
12	At that moment the value of Formula
13	One multiplied then and there. That was my
14	call. Pignatti understood it for sure. Magnoni
15	understood it for sure. Bernard understood it.
16	I had heard that there was opposition to it, but
17	it was mathematically so compelling that what
18	could have got wrong is if I hadn't gotten my
19	advice in immediately and if the CVC offer had
20	shown up first, there is a risk that some people
21	trying to curry favors with CVC would have said
22	nice things to CVC that the firm might have then
23	found difficult to retract.
24	Q. At the point that you were providing
25	this advice, did you discuss with anyone the

1	MARSONER
2	possibility of being compensated for it?
3	A. I didn't have to. I was a paid
4	advisor. Terms were very clear.
5	Q. Because of the advisory services
6	agreements?
7	A. Yeah, absolutely, the 10 percent of
8	firm revenues had been set in stone from the
9	outset, and as the Cerberus BAWAG deal showed,
10	which was probably the second most important
11	thing I had done for Lehman, there was no
12	necessity to document that any further.
13	Q. So Lehman had agreed to pay you ten
14	percent of firm revenues for your advice in
15	Formula One?
16	A. Absolutely, for the simple reason that
17	those rules existed, were well understood by
18	everybody, and I was asked officially to help
19	out by one of the most senior people in Lehman
20	investment banking, Vittorio Pignatti. There
21	was nothing further that I needed to do or would
22	have actually been inclined to do.
23	Might Pignatti, in the way he
24	described it, have used the high negotiating
25	power that Lehman had to negotiate me down at

1	MARSONER
2	some point in the future, he might well have.
3	Christian Meissner did not do that in BAWAG
4	Cerberus, and I'd like to sort of make it very
5	clear that while I am trying always to be very
6	constructive, the negotiation that would have
7	negotiated me down from the well established
8	general rule never took place, and a bankrupt
9	Lehman does not have the negotiating power that
10	the living Lehman would have had.
11	So the rules were in place. I was
12	officially asked to work on it. That is all
13	that matters.
14	Q. Where is this general rule that you
15	would be paid 10 percent documented?
16	MR. VAN TOL: Objection, asked and
17	answered. You can answer again.
18	A. Yeah. In every one of the agreements,
19	the specific one that was in force, the specific
20	one whose rules were in force at the time is the
21	'04 agreement. It says very clearly 20 percent
22	of the IBD fees, which in the case of M&A fees
23	means 20 percent of M&A fees, in the case of
24	financing fees it means 10 percent of firm
25	revenues, and in the case of holding gains, net

1	MARSONER
2	of holding losses, it means 10 percent of those
3	net gains. The contract says that very, very
4	clearly.
5	MS. ALVAREZ: Why don't we take a look
6	at it?
7	(Marsoner Exhibit 4, Multipage
8	document bearing the heading Lehman Brothers,
9	dated 13th February 2004, addressed to Thomas
10	Marsoner, and bearing no Bates stamps, marked
11	for identification)
12	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
13	Q. So we have marked as Exhibit 4 the
14	letter agreement between Lehman Brothers Europe
15	Limited and Dr. Marsoner dated February 13,
16	2004.
17	This is the 2004 agreement that you
18	were just referring to?
19	A. I'm just looking at it.
20	(Pause)
21	Q. I'll represent this was attached as
22	Exhibit C to your motion as you can tell from
23	the header.
24	A. Sorry
25	MR. VAN TOL: That was for us. Don't

1	MARSONER
2	worry.
3	(Pause)
4	Q. I don't need you to look at the
5	provision now, I just want to make sure this is
6	the correct agreement.
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And this agreement is dated February
9	13, 2004?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. Then under the date I see your name
12	and an address?
13	A. Hm—hmm.
14	Q. What address is this?
15	A. This is the house of a friend of mine
16	in Malta where I stayed for a few days in that
17	time period, in the '04 time period. I have not
18	stayed since.
19	If I may digress, I'll tell you why
20	the first agreement had the Austrian address and
21	the last two had the Austrian address, but the
22	middle two had different addresses. It is
23	entirely UK tax driven. In the UK, perfectly
24	legally, for non-UK citizens would distinguish
25	between onshore income and offshore income.

Page 62

MARSONER 1 2 Q. Okay. 3 A. And it -- particularly in this time 4 period I did not want to have a cosmetic piece 5 of paper out there that suggested that I was -that this income, which was classic legal 6 7 offshore income for UK purposes, was either 8 Austrian taxable or UK taxable. Has nothing to do with the substance. This was just cosmetic. 9 10 Everybody at Lehman knew where to find 11 me, everybody at Lehman knew both my Austrian 12 domiciliary address and my London residency address, and everybody at Lehman also knew that 13 14 this was tax cosmetics. 15 Q. When you say everybody at Lehman, you 16 are referring to your contacts on F1? 17 My contacts there, yes. Α. 18 Q. So if you look at this agreement, it 19 is between Lehman Brothers Europe Limited and 20 vou. correct? 21 I believe the whole Lehman Group is Α. encompassed by it, represented by Lehman 22 23 Brothers Europe Limited. You see in line 5 that 24 it says I will provide advice and assistance 25 also to other members of the Lehman Brothers

1	MARSONER
2	group. So the way I have always looked at these
3	agreements was that I was advising all of Lehman
4	worldwide. Lehman Brothers Europe Limited was
5	the point of contact.
6	Q. And Lehman Brothers Europe Limited was
7	the signatory to the agreement, they actually
8	signed the agreement?
9	A. Europe Limited was indeed it was
10	the corporate finance advisory company, was
11	indeed the signatory on behalf of the Lehman
12	Group.
13	Q. Is that Pignatti's signature?
14	A. That is Pignatti's signature, yes.
15	Q. Were there any amendments to this
16	agreement?
17	A. Can you define the word "amendments"
18	for me so I understand it better?
19	Q. Sure. Were there ever any supplements
20	to this agreement negotiated and executed?
21	A. The way I look at it in substance, my
22	conversation, my e-mail conversation with Tom
23	Bernard was very much certainly in the spirit of
24	such an amendment: Inclined to take your
25	advice, accept your advice, while this is huge

1	MARSONER
2	and all that.
3	Q. Other than that e-mail, was that
4	you called it a spirit of an amendment ever
5	documented?
6	A. Other than in the e-mail it wasn't and
7	it didn't have to be.
8	Q. Let's look at the terms more
9	specifically of this agreement.
10	Let's look at Section 3 which is
11	entitled: Compensation Payable to the
12	Consultant.
13	Do you see that?
14	A. Yeah.
15	Q. Now, this Section 3 identifies the
16	compensation that you would be paid under this
17	agreement?
18	A. Hm—hmm.
19	Q. And Section 3(i) states that a fee of
20	150,000 pounds
21	MR. VAN TOL: Euros.
22	Q. Euros would be paid to you?
23	A. I'm sorry yeah, I see that, yeah.
24	Q. Was that paid to you?
25	A. I believe so, yes.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Section 3(ii) identifies the quarterly
3	fees that you would be paid under the agreement?
4	A. Hm-hmm.
5	Q. Were those paid to you?
6	A. I believe so.
7	Q. Then if you look at Sections (iii)
8	(iii) through almost the end of it, through
9	(viii), these provisions identify various
10	transactions that you were working on with
11	Lehman, correct?
12	A. That's correct, yes.
13	Q. And they identify how much you would
14	be paid by Lehman for each of the transactions?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Now, Formula One is not identified in
17	any of these paragraphs, correct?
18	A. It is not and it doesn't have to
19	because there is the catchall clause nine.
20	Q. So let's look at the catchall clause
21	nine. I'm just going to read it for the record:
22	In relation to any other agreed
23	transaction provided that A and it's a little
24	cut off so I'm doing my best here, correct me if
25	I state anything wrong (A) such transaction

1	MARSONER
2	completes during the payment period and (B) the
3	consultant provides substantial services to
4	Lehman Brothers in relation to such agreed
5	transaction, Lehman Brothers shall pay the
6	consultant a I assume it would says fee
7	based on a to be agreed upon percentage of the
8	net banking revenues which are both earned and
9	received by Lehman Brothers.
10	Then the rest of this page is cut off.
11	Do you see that?
12	A. I see it, yes.
13	MR. VAN TOL: Just a correction. It
14	says: Net investment banking revenues.
15	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay.
16	Q. Do you have a copy of this agreement
17	that's not cut off?
18	A. I hope so. I did not have it in
19	London when you asked last week. I have these
20	in the file in Austria and when I find it you
21	will immediately get it.
22	DISCOVERY REQUEST
23	
24	MS. ALVAREZ: We would call for the
25	production of the document.

1	MARSONER
2	I'll tell you that a few of these
3	this is not the only one that's cut off, some of
4	the other the 2002, I think, and the 2006 are
5	cut off as well, so if you can look for the
6	full, complete copies.
7	MR. VAN TOL: We'll make the same
8	request to you.
9	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
10	MR. VAN TOL: Not to you, we are
11	making the same request to Lehman for a copy of
12	its own agreement.
13	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
14	Q. Right here so it says: Lehman
15	Brothers shall pay the consultant a fee based on
16	a to be agreed upon percentage of the net
17	investment banking revenue.
18	Was a percentage agreed upon between
19	Lehman and you for F1?
20	A. The percentage, 10 percent of firm
21	revenues is the default percentage that has been
22	in force at all times during the consultancy
23	period. It didn't have to be specifically
24	agreed another time. It was the well understood
25	fee for which I provided my services.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Where does it state in this agreement
3	that 10 percent was the default fee that you
4	would be paid under the consultancy?
5	A. If you look at all the agreements, you
6	will find 20 percent of IBD fees everywhere,
7	including in this one and the prior ones.
8	Q. Well, point it out to me. Where does
9	it say that you would be paid 10 percent as the
10	default role?
11	A. I'm trying to point out to you that it
12	was the agreed percentage, and the best place
13	for you to see that is probably the Graham
14	Wilson e-mail to me at the end of BAWAG Cerberus
15	which is appended as an exhibit to our motion
16	here. That is also not specifically captioned
17	in any one paragraph here, but that reflects
18	exactly the rule I just told you: 20 percent of
19	M&A fees, 10 percent of financing fees, 10
20	percent of net holding gains.
21	Q. So the Graham Wilson e-mail would be
22	the best place to look, not the actual
23	agreement?
24	A. The Graham Wilson e-mail is the best
25	place to look how, even without a specific

Page 69

MARSONER 1 2 reference in any one of the five agreements, 3 Lehman Brothers very happily paid the 4 agreed-upon percentages in a relatively major 5 transaction when this was a hundred million fees and -- to Lehman, and nearly ten to me, without 6 7 it having been captioned in any one of those 8 individual points in any one of the individual 9 agreements. 10 Other than BAWAG which we'll talk Q. about, what other transactions have you been 11 12 paid for that are not covered by your advisory services agreements? 13 14 A. That I do not currently know. 15 would have to go back to my banking records. 16 Certainly BAWAG was the only major one. 17 may well have been smaller ones, but I do not 18 currently -- I do not currently know that 19 offhand. I certainly know that the two biggest, 20 F1 and BAWAG Cerberus, were not in any paragraph 21 of any individual formal document. Q. 22 Let's take a look at this paragraph 39 23 that we were just looking at, and it refers to 24 in relation to any other agreed transaction. 25 Do you see that?

1	MARSONER
2	A. Hm-hmm.
3	Q. What would you consider well, let's
4	look at the definition of agreed transaction,
5	actually.
6	On the very next page do you see it
7	says: Agreed transaction means any transaction
8	which Lehman Brothers I assume that word is
9	"has" but correct me if I am wrong because it's
10	cut off has specifically designated in
11	writing to the consultant as falling within the
12	ambit of this agreement.
13	Do you see that?
14	A. Hm-hmm.
15	Q. And Formula One you have no
16	separate writing designating Formula One as an
17	agreed transaction, correct?
18	A. I consider my e-mail exchange with Tom
19	Bernard, that designation in writing. And I
20	certainly considered the formal oral request by
21	Pignatti to advise them on F1, mutually, in good
22	faith, as a very material matter, too.
23	Q. Now, Pignatti never agreed in an
24	e-mail to pay you 10 percent for your work on
25	Formula One, correct?

1	MARSONER
2	A. Pignatti in a letter to the court
3	correctly compares it to my work for BAWAG
4	Cerberus which triggered the 10 percent.
5	Q. You know, that was not my question.
6	My question was, Pignatti never agreed
7	to pay you 10 percent in an e-mail, correct?
8	A. Pignatti never tried to negotiate the
9	usual 10 percent down. He didn't have to write
10	me an e-mail reconfirming them. They were
11	mutually usually agreed.
12	Q. So, then, there was no e-mail?
13	A. There was no e-mail by Pignatti trying
14	to negotiate me down, that is correct.
15	Q. Was there an e-mail from anyone at
16	Lehman agreeing to pay you 10 percent for your
17	services on F1?
18	A. There did not have to be an e-mail by
19	anybody. This was the well-established course
20	of dealings between Lehman and me.
21	Q. So no e-mail?
22	A. There was no e-mail negotiating me
23	down, absolutely not.
24	Q. And no advisory services agreement
25	identifying Formula One as a transaction for

1	MARSONER
2	which you would be paid?
3	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
4	You may answer.
5	A. Could you just rephrase that, please?
6	Q. Sure. Could you just repeat the
7	question so I can hear it?
8	(Question read)
9	A. There was, of course we all have
10	the documents no reference to Formula One
11	specifically in any one of these five. That
12	does not mean that Lehman did not ask me to
13	provide services at the usual generally agreed
14	terms.
15	Q. Okay. I understand that.
16	I just want to make sure are there
17	any other consultancy agreements that we don't
18	have?
19	A. There were these five.
20	Q. Were there any amendments or addendums
21	to any of these consultancy agreements?
22	A. I do not recall any amendments or
23	addendums, no.
24	Q. Did you ever ask that Formula One be
25	added to any one of these agreements?

1	MARSONER
2	A. I never did because I never needed to.
3	All I did is prepare the ground for such time as
4	revenues would become visible, which it turns
5	out only happened in 2012.
6	Q. So between 2005 and 2012, you never
7	put down in writing put down in writing how
8	much you would be paid by Lehman Brothers for
9	your assistance on F1?
10	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
11	You may answer.
12	A. What I did put down in one of the
13	e-mails to Bernard and Pignatti and so on was a
14	sentence to the fact of that my senior advice
15	would continue to be available at the usual
16	modest percentage, something along those lines.
17	But that was not the request, that was a
18	statement of fact.
19	My prepare-the-ground conversation
20	with Jeremy Isaacs in 2007 then led to a
21	conversation between Sherratt and me. As I came
22	out of the room he asked me:
23	How did your chat with Jeremy go,
24	Thomas?
25	I said: Very well. And by the way,
1	

Page 74

MARSONER 1 2 the F1 thing that we both worked on looks pretty 3 good these days, doesn't it, Peter? 4 To which he said: Yes, but we've also 5 had very high costs here. And I reflected on that a little bit. 6 7 actually in fairly great detail, and I ended up 8 agreeing with him, which you see in the way I 9 presented my claim: A living Lehman in reality 10 only got its 300 million that it originally 11 invested in Kirch, plus a little bit of money 12 for interest and costs back. So as long as Lehman was alive, no 13 14 firm revenues that would have triggered a fee of 15 mine had actually occurred. My source for that was Sherratt after the conversation with Isaacs 16 17 and I actually agree. In fairness Lehman had 18 put 300 in and got a little bit more than 300 19 out but hadn't actually earned any cash before 20 its bankruptcy. 21 Q. What about -- were you aware of the 22 refinancing that occurred in 2006? 23 A. That's exactly what I meant with the 24 312 million or whatever the number is that is in 25 my statement of claim.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. So during as a result of the
3	refinancing, the shareholders were paid
4	dividends, correct?
5	A. The shareholders were paid dividends
6	and Lehman got its 300 million back. That's
7	right.
8	Q. At that point did Lehman provide you
9	any compensation for your work on F1?
10	A. I didn't ask for it. Lehman had only
11	gotten its money back, 300 in, a bit more than
12	300 out. It could be argued that after interest
13	Lehman was actually still in the hole on F1 as
14	it went bankrupt.
15	Q. At that point
16	A. There was certainly no profit that
17	would have, in fairness, triggered my fee.
18	Q. At that point you didn't raise with
19	anyone at Lehman the possibility of getting any
20	of that?
21	MR. VAN TOL: Objection.
22	Mischaracterizes evidence.
23	You may answer.
24	A. I very much prepared the ground. You
25	have the Jeremy Isaacs e-mail. You now have

1	MARSONER	
2	apologies, I had not searched for that	
3	earlier the Bonacker e-mail. But the history	
4	of the Bonacker e-mails, there are actually two,	
5	was interesting.	
6	Bonacker, who at one point complained	
7	to me that young Schmitz-Markramer was running	
8	around the firm taking victory laps for F1. So	
9	I said and that was difficult for Bonacker,	
10	so I sent Bonacker those two e-mails to with,	
11	I think I mean, you have them words to the	
12	effect of: Look who really deserves the credit	
13	for F1.	
14	And then ultimately in August 2008 I	
15	went to see Dick Fuld in New York about	
16	originally came to pass, it's in disclosure,	
17	that he kindly called me after the Cerberus	
18	people had told me, that it was actually I who	
19	had done the Cerberus BAWAG deal.	
20	And so, longer story, he ultimately	
21	invited to come see him in New York City in	
22	August of 2008, of all time periods. That's one	
23	of those meetings one doesn't easily forget. As	
24	I walked into his office he hugged me. I have	

1	MARSONER
2	we have not really been on hugging terms before.
3	We then discussed a number of things,
4	particularly with my financial institution's
5	hat. And ultimately he said: So what else have
6	you been up to?
7	To which I said: Oh, Dick, in
8	addition to the essentially hundred million that
9	I made you on BAWAG Cerberus and a few other
10	things, by far the most important thing that
11	I've done for you was your F1 investment.
12	To which he and I see it in front
13	of me used a an old fashioned thank you
14	gesture as one does in old movies, followed by:
15	Now, Thomas, you'll forgive me, I have another
16	50,000 things to do.
17	And I left his office. So that was
18	exactly three weeks before Lehman filed.
19	Q. And —
20	A. So so but I certainly also
21	then that was certainly the last prepare the
22	groundwork that I had done. It certainly would
23	not have occurred to me in any way to ask Dick
24	to pay me a fee, and the chief reason for that
25	was that no revenues were visible.

1	MARSONER
2	It's in your discovery that the
3	Pignatti-Rouner e-mail says exactly at one at
4	what point we actually put pen to paper, so I
5	was working on a lot of things that on
6	nowhere here also because they never
7	materialized.
8	So if we had always captured
9	everything that I was working on in one of these
10	agreements, all we would have done is write
11	agreements and never done any real work.
12	Q. Other than BAWAG which we have talked
13	about and Formula One which we have talked
14	about, what other things were you working on
15	that never materialized that were not covered by
16	these agreements?
17	MR. VAN TOL: There is a lot of
18	negatives. I'm going to object to the form. I
19	don't understand the question.
20	If you understand you may answer.
21	A. I think I do understand the question.
22	Q. Okay.
23	A. And if I may, I would like to go back,
24	give you a list. There were a whole number of
25	things that one works on and that and where

1	MARSONER
2	revenues never become visible, and then some die
3	and then there is no point in ever putting them
4	in.
5	In F1, revenues became visible for the
6	first time in 2012. In May 2012 and in August
7	2012 I made my claim to my contractual
8	counterpart LBEL.
9	Q. That claim was filed in the UK
10	proceedings, right?
11	A. It was first just filed with the UK
12	administrator. It was only after the UK
13	administrator rejected it that I commenced
14	proceedings.
15	Q. What happened in May 2012?
16	A. There was a very visible sell down by
17	CVC to a US asset management firm called Waddell
18	Reed who was joined by Blackstone and, I
19	believe, the Norwegian Sovereign Wealth Fund
20	that essentially took half of the CVC stake.
21	At the same time there was another big
22	refinancing. The details are in the landscape
23	piece of paper that I attached to my motion. It
24	was at that point that a valuation of F1 became
25	visible from the outside for the first time.

MARSONER
And if I may add, Mr. Mackenzie, the
senior CVC partner, in about 2012 in one of the
Bernie Ecclestone legal proceedings, stated
under oath that as late as 2011 he, Mackenzie of
CVC, still thought that his stake may be worth
zero.
MS. ALVAREZ: Why don't we take
another break.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:44
a.m. We are going off the record.
(Recess)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins media
number three. The time is 12:09 p.m. We are
back on the record.
BY MS. ALVAREZ:
Q. Dr. Marsoner, I would like to go back
and take a look at Exhibit 4 which was your 2004
consultancy agreement with Lehman.
Is this the agreement you rely is
this the agreement you rely on as the basis for
your claim?
A. It's the contents of the agreement
that I rely upon. Technically it had, of
course, expired, and technically it was

1	MARSONER
2	abrogated by the next one, but in the
3	interregnum period, during which I worked with
4	Lehman seamlessly, there had to have been rules
5	that governed the mutual behavior. And I
6	contend that the rules were exactly those that
7	were in here because this is the way it had also
8	happened when agreements before had expired.
9	Q. Do you rely on the contents of the
10	2006 agreement for your claim?
11	A. No, I couldn't, because the salient
12	aspect of F1 was my exchange with Tom Bernard,
13	and that predates the '06 agreement materially.
14	Q. So, then, you don't rely on the
15	contents of the 2007 agreement either?
16	A. I do not rely on the contents of the
17	2007 agreement either, no. It is the contents
18	of the 2004 agreement that I rely on for the
19	for the formal the contract part of my claim.
20	Additional and separate to that is, of
21	course, the quantum meruit part of my claim.
22	Q. If you can turn to Section 3 again of
23	Exhibit 4 which is the compensation provision or
24	the compensation section. As you see, it states
25	that you would be paid a retainer and a

1	MARSONER
2	quarterly fee.
3	Do you see that?
4	A. Hm-hmm.
5	Q. Were you typically paid retainers when
6	you executed these consultancy agreements?
7	A. I am not sure about the early ones,
8	but, yes, I mean, typically I think the way you
9	phrase it is correct. Typically I was paid
10	retainer fees which were in all cases fully
11	applicable against the success fees.
12	Q. What was the purpose of these retainer
13	fees?
14	A. Retainer fees in the investment
15	banking business are essentially earnest fees.
16	They are just they are certainly more
17	symbolic than actual, and they are certainly not
18	intended to be compensation for services
19	rendered. They I think earnest fee is a good
20	way to describe it, retainer fee in the
21	investment banking world.
22	We are being real with each other.
23	Here is some money which obviously then gets
24	deducted from what you really work for, the
25	success fee, but just so we are all so we all

1	MARSONER	
2	know that we mean it seriously with each other.	
3	Of course, it creates a moral	
4	obligation on my side to actually do something,	
5	not just sit here, collect retainer.	
6	Q. So it essentially makes it official	
7	that you are being retained as an advisor for	
8	Lehman Brothers	
9	A. I'm trying to think about that a	
10	little bit, but I think when I say earnest fee	
11	and you say makes it official that I'm a	
12	retained paid advisor, then I think we are	
13	talking about the same thing, yeah.	
14	Q. Well, let's clarify.	
15	You said, you know, it gave you a	
16	moral obligation.	
17	To do what?	
18	A. To find deals.	
19	Q. Were you paid a retainer under the	
20	2006 agreement as well?	
21	A. I believe so. We have it here I	
22	believe there were retainers. I'm not sure	
23	about the very first ones, but I believe that	
24	there were retainers most of the time if not all	
25	the time.	

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Do you have a claim that Lehman owes
3	you a retainer under any of your agreements?
4	A. Do you mean do I have a claim in
5	bankruptcy against Lehman or
6	Q. Let me rephrase.
7	Do you contend that Lehman owes you a
8	retainer under any of the agreements that has
9	not been paid?
10	A. Oh, at this point do I claim that I
11	believe that the last fees that LBEL paid me,
12	which were sort of BAWAG derivative fees, were
13	paid net were either paid net of retainer or
14	inclusive of a retainer that hasn't been paid.
15	So, no, I do not so as I think
16	about this, I do not think that Lehman owes me
17	any retainer fees at this stage.
18	Q. And if you look at paragraph three,
19	(ii), it refers to a quarterly fee that would be
20	paid to you, correct?
21	A. Hm—hmm.
22	Q. What was the purpose of a quarterly
23	fee?
24	A. Same thing. Up front retainer,
25	quarterly retainer, is the same thing.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Were you typically paid quarterly fees
3	under the agreements?
4	A. Yeah, I believe so. Fairly classic,
5	up front and quarterly.
6	MS. ALVAREZ: Let's take a look at
7	your declaration which we'll mark as the next
8	exhibit.
9	(Marsoner Exhibit 5, Five-page
10	document entitled Declaration of Dr. Thomas
11	Marsoner in Support of the Motion of Dr. Thomas
12	Marsoner to Deem Proofs of Claim to be Timely
13	Filed by the Claims Bar Date, with cover page
14	labeled Exhibit B, and bearing no Bates stamps,
15	marked for identification)
16	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
17	Q. If you just take a look, this is the
18	declaration that you submitted in support of
19	your motion, correct?
20	A. Hm-hmm.
21	Q. We covered a lot of the information
22	that's in here already, so I think we can jump
23	down to paragraph eight, and in this declaration
24	you state: In 2005 I advised Lehman in my role
25	as senior advisor in both e-mails and in

1	MARSONER
2	telephone conversations to continue Lehman's
3	investment in F1, which service I explicitly
4	provided in exchange for 10 percent of Lehman's
5	revenues related to the transaction as was
6	customary under the agreements. Lehman agreed
7	both orally and by e-mail to this fee in
8	exchange for my F1 advice.
9	Do you see that?
10	A. I see that, yes.
11	Q. When you say Lehman agreed orally to
12	the 10 percent fee, what are you referring to?
13	A. The retention of my services by
14	Pignatti originally.
15	Q. So these the telephone calls with
16	Pignatti?
17	A. The meeting when he told me that
18	JPMorgan didn't require my services which cost
19	them a billion dollars, and when he then said:
20	But certainly we want to continue to work with
21	you on this, Thomas.
22	Q. During that meeting did Pignatti tell
23	you: We will pay you 10 percent of Lehman's
24	revenues related to the transaction?
25	A. He used the word to "deepen" the

1	MARSONER
2	relationship. The relationship was well
3	defined. When he said "I want to deepen it," it
4	was very clear what he meant.
5	Q. Okay. Did anyone else at Lehman
6	Brothers tell you orally that they would pay you
7	10 percent of Lehman's revenues related to the
8	transaction?
9	A. The course of dealings was so well
10	established within BAWAG Cerberus, you saw how
11	that found its way on to a piece of paper, the
12	10 percent, the 20 percent that we have now been
13	through quite a few times.
14	So against that background, whoever I
15	dealt with at Lehman, whether it was Pignatti or
16	later Bonacker or Meissner, the ground rule was
17	my services come in exchange for 10 percent of
18	firm revenues.
19	Q. Okay. So no one specifically said to
20	you you'll be paid 10 percent for Formula One?
21	A. Nobody had to tell me that
22	specifically.
23	Q. Okay. You also say here you said
24	Lehman agreed both orally, and then you said:
25	And by e-mail to this fee in exchange for my F1

1	MARSONER
2	advice.
3	What e-mail are you referring to or
4	e-mails?
5	A. I refer to the Tom Bernard e-mail
6	exchange in which I said in which I wrote:
7	My senior advice continues to be available,
8	which was just a reminder, a factual statement
9	of fact, and where Tom Bernard responds: We are
10	inclined to accept your advice.
11	Q. Are you relying on any other e-mails
12	for the statement?
13	A. The Bernard e-mail exchange is the
14	main in writing part that I rely on.
15	MS. ALVAREZ: So we will take a look
16	at it.
17	(Marsoner Exhibit 6, Multipage e-mail
18	chain bearing at the top of the first page an
19	e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Thomas Bernard,
20	dated Thursday, December 1, 2005, and Bates
21	stamped LEH_0000214 through 217, marked for
22	identification)
23	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
24	Q. You can take a look at this. It's a
25	long e-mail string, but let me know if the

1	MARSONER
2	e-mail you are referring to is here. This is
3	marked Lehman 214 through Lehman 217.
4	A. I believe that is it, yes.
5	Q. Well, let's start at the bottom of the
6	e-mail string which would be the first e-mail
7	which actually starts on the bottom of Lehman
8	3 215.
9	If you take a look it is an e-mail
10	from you to Vittorio Pignatti dated November 25,
11	2005. Subject reads: F1 group sold to CVC
12	Capital Partners for undisclosed sum.
13	Now, in the very first sentence you
14	say: If this is the deal I suspect it is, my
15	senior advice is strongly against selling now.
16	Do you see that?
17	A. Yeah, I see that.
18	Q. Then you provide you have three
19	numbers here, so you provide three reasons for
20	your advice. Then so this is what you were
21	referring to when you advised Lehman Brothers
22	not to sell its stake in Formula One?
23	A. This is where I started. It's the
24	next one when I had the hard information. The
25	first one I suspected it because there was no

1	MARSONER
2	way CVC would buy a one-year earnings quality
3	business, and in the next one I had heard that
4	Ron Dennis was supportive. At that point I knew
5	that they had done a deal.
6	Q. So, now, this first e-mail, the
7	November 25th, you sent to Pignatti only?
8	A. Hm—hmm.
9	Q. Then the second e-mail that you are
10	referring to is dated November 26. You also
11	sent it to Peter Sherratt and Tom Bernard?
12	A. Hm—hmm.
13	Q. Why did you add Peter Sherratt to the
14	e-mail?
15	A. Well, there are obviously legal
16	implications, and Peter has been around this
17	from the outset. So it was essentially Pignatti
18	was my direct interlocutor. The first one I
19	think you might want to consider an ordinary
20	course of dealings where I share my suspicion
21	with the guy I deal with all the time. The next
22	one starts with: Erat demonstrandum.
23	There I had hard information, and
24	that, I thought, I should send officially to the
25	group, that as far as I was concerned, was

1	MARSONER
2	looking after Lehman's F1 stake.
3	Q. Okay. And I assume you copied Tom
4	Bernard for the same reason?
5	A. Yeah, yeah. Tom has always been
6	described to me from the discussed in '02 as
7	the decision maker on F1.
8	Q. So when you sent the e-mail on
9	November 25, had Pignatti asked for your advice
10	on whether to sell its stake, whether Lehman
11	should sell its stake in Formula One?
12	A. This is probably the thirtieth in the
13	series commencing with: Sorry, Thomas, JPMorgan
14	have no interest, but please continue to work
15	for us on this.
16	And then I mean, there are there
17	is a whole stack somewhere in the documents, and
18	I just provided updates. This was a pretty
19	important update, but it wasn't yet crucial.
20	Q. I want to make sure I understand.
21	So you said there was an e-mail from
22	Pignatti asking you to continue
23	A. No, that was the conversation I told
24	you about when he called me into his office
25	after he had learned that JPMorgan thought they

1	MARSONER
2	knew it all anyway.
3	Q. And that conversation occurred prior
4	to November 25?
5	A. Oh, yeah, that occurred three years
6	prior to November 25th of '02 of '05. It
7	occurred in '02 at the end of the JPMorgan
8	discussion.
9	Q. So, then, if you look if you can
10	look at Lehman 216 which is the bottom of the
11	November 25th e-mail, the second to last
12	paragraph states: Needless to say, if a fresh
13	face were helpful to facilitate things here,
14	mine continues to be available for a very modest
15	percentage participation in LB's gain upon
16	eventual sale.
17	Do you see that?
18	A. Yes, I see that.
19	Q. What did you mean by the statement?
20	A. It is a factual statement just
21	reconfirming that I was working here for my
22	usual modest percentage, ten to be precise.
23	Q. Did Pignatti respond to this e-mail?
24	A. There was one response by him
25	somewhere in this chain which was a two-word

1	MARSONER
2	response with the words "the devil."
3	And what that was was Pignatti making
4	fun of a young colleague of ours called Makram
5	Azar, who sort of two days after we had
6	essentially done all the material stuff that
7	needed to be done and needed to be discussed,
8	offered to start working on it.
9	So there is a it's somewhere in the
10	disclosure, there is a written acknowledgment by
11	Pignatti to very much have received and read
12	these e-mails by making fun of somebody that
13	offered his services way after the fact.
14	Q. Is there written acknowledgment from
15	Pignatti agreeing to pay you a very modest
16	percentage participation in LB's gain upon
17	eventual sale?
18	A. There didn't have to be. The terms
19	were clear from the outset.
20	Q. So nothing in writing?
21	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
22	A. The course of dealings between
23	Pignatti and me, between Lehman and me was very
24	clearly established. It did not require any
25	further repetition.

_	MADOONED
1	MARSONER
2	Q. So let's look let's look at the
3	November 26 e-mail which is on Lehman 215. This
4	is the e-mail we were discussing a few minutes
5	ago where you sent it to Pignatti, Peter
6	Sherratt and Tom Bernard, and again you provide
7	some more information regarding F1.
8	And then in the second paragraph you
9	state: Hence, don't also panic, keep your stake
10	and don't be spooked if JPM does a BayLaBa. As
11	a matter of fact, JPM selling out would make it
12	easier to admit LP to the top (Alpha Prema)
13	table.
14	Then you state in the third paragraph:
15	If conversely you want to get LB out of the F1
16	headlines (or feel your relationship with Bernie
17	has become too bad), a Marsoner family company
18	previously involved in consumer products would
19	happily consider taking it on if it comes with a
20	to-be-agreed financing package fairly sharing
21	risks and rewards.
22	Do you see that?
23	A. I see that, yes.
24	Q. What did you mean by that?
25	A. That was an offer that turned out to

Page 95

MARSONER 1 2 be completely unnecessary because Lehman was 3 very happy to stay invested and have its name as 4 a shareholder. 5 So that was just an alternative offer 6 that it turns out was not necessary and -- and 7 therefore it was neither taken up nor discussed. 8 Has nothing to do with my advisory relationship. 9 This was a principal offer. 10 Q. An offer by whom? 11 A. Well, the company's name would have 12 been Getranke Management, a -- that was a client 13 of Lehman's publicly known to have been involved 14 in the great Austrian beer wars where Pignatti 15 actually advised us, the Marsoner family, who 16 were the principals at the time, in a whole series of difficult discussions that have no 17 18 bearing on this topic, but it's a -- it was so 19 well known and it was the largest shareholder of 20 the largest brewer in the country which had 56 21 percent market share, so it's a substantial 22 company that would have been credible as an 23 investor if they had needed it. But nothing to 24 do with my advisory relationship. 25 Q. Now, you call it a Marsoner family

1	MARSONER
2	company?
3	A. Yeah.
4	Q. What interest do you have in this
5	company or did you have at the time?
6	A. This was primarily my dad's company.
7	I my interest in it sort of evolved over
8	time. What it was at that point in time I don't
9	remember, but it's best described as a Marsoner
10	family company.
11	Q. Now, had Lehman taken you up on the
12	offer and this Marsoner family company purchased
13	Lehman's stake, how would you, as Lehman's
14	advisor, have been compensated?
15	MR. VAN TOL: Objection, calls for
16	speculation.
17	A. That would have required a complete
18	new set of negotiations. It never came to it.
19	Q. So you would have had to have
20	negotiated your fee at that point?
21	A. If this had come to pass, obviously a
22	potential conflict of interest would have
23	arisen. That potential conflict of interest,
24	which never did arise because it never came to
25	pass, would have had to be managed in some way,

1	MARSONER
2	just as it was managed when years before I was
3	still a Lehman employee recusing myself of all
4	beer matters and acting only and acting only
5	as a principal with Pignatti advising me.
6	We were always very careful to
7	precisely document in those years what I did as
8	an employee and what I would have done for this
9	company. But, again, it's not material here.
10	It was an offer that I made because I did sense
11	that a staid bank and a shareholder in Formula
12	One doesn't necessarily go together very easily.
13	As we have seen from JPMorgan getting
14	out, as we've seen from Bayerische Landesbank
15	getting out, F1 is high publicity, high drama,
16	not an obvious investment for a bank, although
17	as it turns out, a fantastic one.
18	Q. Other than your conversations with Tom
19	Bernard and Pignatti, did you have conversations
20	with anyone else at Lehman about whether Lehman
21	should retain its stake in Formula One?
22	A. During that time?
23	Q. Yes.
24	A. Magnoni for sure.
25	Q. Anyone else?
ĺ	

1	MARSONER
2	A. Through Magnoni, by definition with
3	Dick Fuld. Magnoni was closest by far of all
4	the characters involved to Dick Fuld. Dick and
5	Magnoni spoke a lot, so I certainly made sure
6	that Magnoni was fully apprized of my views at
7	the time so as to make sure that Dick would know
8	about it.
9	Q. Did Magnoni ever
10	A. Dick Fuld.
11	Q. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you
12	off.
13	Did Magnoni ever tell you that he told
14	Dick Fuld?
15	A. Oh, yeah. The history, I think, some
16	of this has been has been said in previous
17	depositions, the history of this investment was
18	a personally somewhat difficult one for both
19	Dick Fuld and Ruggero Magnoni, because when
20	originally the Kirch loan was extended, my
21	understanding is that Ruggero proposed it in the
22	European Capital Commitments Committee or Credit
23	Committee or whatever actually turned it down,
24	whereupon Ruggero got on the plane to New York
25	and convinced Dick to do it anyway because it

Page 9	9
--------	---

1	MARSONER
2	was so well collateralized, at which point Dick
3	overruled the committee and Lehman gave the
4	Ioan.
5	When that then blew up, it was not an
6	easy situation, certainly not for Ruggero, and,
7	you know, probably even something that Dick
8	didn't completely disregard.
9	Q. Okay. Then how do you know that
10	Magnoni kept Dick Fuld apprized of the advice
11	you were giving on F1?
12	MR. VAN TOL: Objection, asked and
13	answered. Go ahead.
14	A. Magnoni told me. Well, I know it from
15	Magnoni, but when I mentioned it to Dick at my,
16	for me, important meeting with him in August of
17	'08, Dick did not sound in the least surprised.
18	MS. ALVAREZ: I think it might be
19	lunch is there. Instead of me starting a new
20	subject, might as well take a break.
21	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 12:40
22	p.m. and we are off the record.
23	* * *
24	LUNCH RECESS
25	* * *

1	MARSONER
2	* * *
3	AFTERNOON SESSION
4	* * *
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:44
6	p.m. We are back on the record.
7	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
8	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Marsoner. If we
9	could take a look at Exhibit 5 which is your
10	declaration that we previously marked.
11	If we could take a look at paragraph
12	ten, you state in the declaration: I later
13	advised Lehman on Gerberus' acquisition of
14	BAWAG, an Austrian bank, from April 2006 to
15	December 2006 for which LBHI paid me 20 percent
16	of the investment banking revenues generated
17	from the transaction, despite the fact that no
18	formal agreement expressly covered the BAWAG
19	transaction.
20	Do you see that?
21	A. I see that, yes.
22	Q. Would you please describe the BAWAG
23	transaction that you are referring to?
24	A. BAWAG is a significant bank in
25	Austria, the fourth largest, which the owner,

1	MARSONER
2	the Austrian trade union organization, had to
3	sell for a number of complicated reasons that
4	don't matter here.
5	Lehman Brothers advised by me, advised
6	Cerberus on this acquisition which was
7	tactically relatively complicated and required a
8	relatively significant amount of prior knowledge
9	of how the Austrian trade union system worked,
10	how the bank worked.
11	It ended up as a three-party auction
12	where our client Cerberus competed with
13	Bayerische Landesbank and Lone Star, the other
14	US it is a distressed debt buying hedge fund.
15	My role, very similar to the F1 case,
16	was one where I really knew the in and outs and
17	the history that had led to the problems that
18	triggered the sale, and so I was able to
19	position Cerberus very early, again, very
20	similar to the F1 case because I saw that this
21	could only be in that case solved by a sale to a
22	new owner, just like F1 in November or so of
23	2005. Very, very fast paced.
24	It was no time for any sort of legal
25	niceties like drawing big advisory agreements.

1	MARSONER	
2	We had to work in a team. I contributed my	
3	experience, and our client won the bid, was	
4	very, very happy with us, actually even which	
5	I am told is pretty rare in this business	
6	voluntarily increased the fee that Cerberus was	
7	due to pay Lehman, and the when the closing	
8	came around, Graham Wilson, who was the chief	
9	administrative officer for Lehman in Europe,	
10	essentially sent me an e-mail with a spreadsheet	
11	which was part of the record here which totaled	
12	up what I was due to receive which is 20 percent	
13	of the M&A fee, being 10 percent of the very	
14	significant financing fee, and also 10 percent	
15	of two principal gains by Lehman, both around	
16	swaps, then deducted from that the quarterly and	
17	other retainer fees.	
18	And I didn't have to negotiate that.	
19	I didn't have it in any of the agreements,	
20	didn't we didn't have to negotiate. It was	
21	just an implementation of the established course	
22	of dealings between Lehman and me completely,	
23	you know, completely problem free.	
24	Q. Now, you have told me a lot here so	
25	we'll take it step by step.	

1	MARSONER
2	A. Sure.
3	Q. When did you start working on BAWAG?
4	A. Very much in parallel to what I told
5	you about F1, that I really started working on
6	F1 at age ten. On BAWAG I started working when
7	Susan Gutfreund, the wife of my then boss John
8	Gutfreund, the CEO of Salomon Brothers, called
9	me up and said: So, Thomas, there is this
10	Austrian in New York City. His name is Wolfgang
11	Flottl. He's a billionaire, he says. What do
12	you know about him?
13	This must have been in 1990. Wolfgang
14	Flottl was the son of the CEO of BAWAG and who
15	went through the world for years looking like a
16	billionaire. Years later it became obvious that
17	the source of his hedge fund was purely loans
18	from daddy's bank which had the additional
19	problem that daddy didn't own the bank, so it
20	was most obviously a highly unstable situation
21	that I had, for lack of a better word, sniffed
22	around for many years until it culminated in a
23	legal situation some of you may have been
24	involved in, Revco was the name of the company
25	in New York that went to the wall, pretty much

1	MARSONER
2	subject: BAWAG sweat equity.
3	Do you see that?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. The text of your e-mail reads: What,
6	please, is my sweat equity in your investment
7	if, on top of, one, creating the opportunity in
8	the first place; two, convincing my buddy plus
9	disciple David to admit you; three, I
10	demonstrably kill the GMAC structure? Please
11	advise. Thanks. T.
12	What did you mean by your sweat
13	equity?
14	A. It was an additional request that I
15	made over and above the fees that were agreed
16	which was turned down by Peter Sherratt,
17	actually.
18	Q. So at this point you already had a
19	conversation with Lehman about your fees in
20	BAWAG?
21	A. No, I did not have to have a
22	conversation about the fees. This was for
23	the reason I set out here, there was an
24	additional component of economics that was made
25	available which was essentially call options,

1	MARSONER
2	stock options, and I raised my hand and said:
3	Could I please have some of those as well, and
4	that was turned down.
5	Q. So this has nothing
6	A. But that had nothing to do with the
7	agreed fees which were paid with no discussion
8	and no problems.
9	Q. Okay. So this had nothing to do with
10	the 20 percent of the investment banking
11	revenues?
12	A. Not at all, this was something that I
13	was asking because I thought it would be fair to
14	get a little extra. The firm thought otherwise
15	and it didn't happen.
16	Q. Okay. Let's look at another document.
17	Let's look at Lehman 203.
18	A. Maybe I could describe it even more
19	precisely now, having precisely reread it.
20	What was completely non-contentious
21	was my advisory work. Here this is Pignatti had
22	moved on. He was no longer my counterpart in
23	as head of M&A he had taken a merchant banking
24	role. And in this merchant banking role, his
25	merchant banking fund got to invest into this

4	MADOONED
1	MARSONER
2	deal.
3	MS. ALVAREZ: This would be eight.
4	This is a one-page document labeled Lehman 203.
5	(Marsoner Exhibit 8, Single-page
6	e-mail from Vittorio to David Stonberg and
7	others, dated Thursday, May 24, 2007, and Bates
8	stamped LEH_0000203, marked for identification)
9	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
10	Q. This is an e-mail from Pignatti to
11	David Stonberg. Cc'd are Michael Odrich and
12	Anthony Tutrone. It's dated May 24th, 2007.
13	I recognize, Dr. Marsoner, that you
14	are not copied here, but have you seen this
15	e-mail before?
16	A. I believe it was produced by your
17	clients in discovery, right?
18	Q. That's right.
19	Do you know who David Stonberg is?
20	A. I'm afraid I don't know him, I don't
21	think I've ever met him nor do I recognize the
22	name.
23	Q. What about Michael Odrich?
24	A. I believe, although I'm not certain,
25	that he at the time was the head of Lehman

1	MARSONER
2	Global Merchant Banking where Pignatti was the
3	head of Lehman European Merchant Banking. That
4	is sort of principal investments out of funds.
5	Q. What about Anthony Tutrone?
6	A. I do not know him.
7	Q. Now, in this e-mail Pignatti states:
8	In addition, an XLB, Thomas Marsoner, who is a
9	consultant for Austria, gave us a lot of help in
10	assessing the political dangers, management role
11	of post office in getting a board seat. For him
12	a three hundred to \$400 carry would be money
13	well spent as he has been retained by Cerberus
14	as permanent senior advisor to BAWAG, and he has
15	been, and will be if we give him carry, a more
16	accessible source of info on BAWAG than the
17	Cerberus guys.
18	Do you see that?
19	A. I see that, yes.
20	MR. VAN TOL: I think it's three
21	hundred to \$400,000.
22	A. It's it concerns
23	MR. VAN TOL: Wait for a question.
24	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
25	Q. I don't know if I mentioned, the

1	MARSONER
2	subject line says: BAWAG IBD fee.
3	Do you see that?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. What does IBD stand for?
6	A. Investment banking department.
7	Q. Do you know what Pignatti meant by the
8	three hundred to \$400,000 carry?
9	A. I can suspect that what he meant is
10	the sweat equity that we discussed before which
11	never happened.
12	Q. So this was never offered to you?
13	A. It was discussed but I was never I
14	was never given this. Also, I have never been
15	retained by Cerberus as a permanent senior
16	advisor to BAWAG, so there is a fairly important
17	part of this sentence here which is just
18	factually false.
19	Q. When were you paid for your work on
20	BAWAG?
21	A. Sorry, when was I paid? I was paid
22	after the closing, relatively soon after the
23	closing, but I don't know what the date of the
24	Graham Wilson e-mail is. Must be something like
25	either May or June of 2007.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Who at Lehman were you working with on
3	that transaction?
4	A. Christian Meissner, Michael Bonacker,
5	Biergen Kreiger.
6	Q. Anyone else?
7	A. No, most of my work was done directly
8	with the Gerberus people.
9	Q. Okay. We are going to shift gears a
10	bit.
11	MS. ALVAREZ: We are going to mark
12	another exhibit. It is Marsoner 159. This one
13	was produced by Dr. Marsoner labeled Marsoner
14	159 and 160.
15	(Marsoner Exhibit 9, Two-page e-mail
16	chain bearing on the top of the first page an
17	e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Jeremy Isaacs,
18	dated Wednesday, July 4, 2007, and Bates stamped
19	Marsoner00000159 and 160, marked for
20	identification)
21	THE WITNESS: Could I just, on this
22	sweat equity, make one clarifying statement?
23	MS. ALVAREZ: Sure.
24	THE WITNESS: This whole sweat equity
25	thing concerns an aspect of this transaction

1	MARSONER
2	that was less than 5 percent of it. Cerberus
3	bought BAWAG for 3.6 billion Euros, and this
4	fund that Pignatti ran co-invested 150 million.
5	So this was a 5 percent co-invest
6	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay.
7	THE WITNESS: that
8	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you.
9	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
10	Q. So if you look at this Exhibit 9, it
11	is an e-mail from you to Jeremy Isaacs dated
12	July 4th, 2007. The subject line reads: Thanks
13	for the coffee.
14	I think we covered this, but I'm going
15	to ask again.
16	Who is Jeremy Isaacs?
17	A. He was at the time the chief executive
18	officer of Lehman Brothers in Europe.
19	Q. Why did you send him this e-mail?
20	A. Primarily, of course, because I sent
21	thank you notes after people invite me for
22	coffee, and my well disclosed and blatantly
23	obviously visible ulterior motive was, of
24	course, the usual, call it victory laps, call it
25	bragging, call it positioning. I would probably

Page 112

MARSONER 1 2 prefer the word positioning, in which I just 3 wanted to put on the record that the Formula One 4 investment that was already looking very good. 5 At that point in time was really primarily based on my timely and correct advice that the senior 6 7 guy, with all due modesty, in my view correctly 8 characterized as: That's huge. 9 So it was to prepare the ground for an 10 eventual fee claim when and if revenues would 11 become visible. 12 Q. Did you tell Jeremy Isaacs that you were expecting to be paid for Formula One? 13 14 A. This was a coffee with a very senior 15 To the best of my He had invited me. 16 knowledge it was very clear to him what I meant 17 both over the coffee and then when I, you know, 18 set it out. But I certainly remained both 19 polite and there was no reason to jump the gun. 20 Revenues were not then visible. 21 Q. So, then, at this point in time you 22 didn't say anything to him about -- or you are 23 saying dropping the gun, you didn't drop the 24 gun, you didn't tell him that you expected to be 25 paid?

1	MARSONER
2	A. I think one can say things quite
3	clearly without putting them prematurely and
4	impolitely. I think by appending my claim to
5	fame e-mails I made very clear what I was
6	implying here. But I didn't do more than imply
7	it, I didn't want to do more, didn't need to do
8	more. It wasn't the time.
9	But I did feel I did feel the need
10	to establish with the senior decision makers at
11	Lehman that the way I looked at it, the F1
12	investment was very much my deal. The reason I
13	was so motivated to make that point at the time
14	was because at least at the time I had come to
15	the conclusion that both Jeremy, chief executive
16	Europe, and certainly Dick Fuld, had heard not
17	from my dear colleagues at Lehman about my role
18	in Cerberus BAWAG, but from the Cerberus guys.
19	Q. Looking at the text of your e-mail,
20	you identify three transactions, Formula One
21	being the third transaction.
22	The first one you identify is Telecom
23	Austria, right?
24	A. Yeah.
25	Q. Was Telecom Austria covered by an

1	MARSONER
2	advisory services agreement?
3	A. There were a whole number of
4	transactions around Telecom Austria that in some
5	ways I was involved in, in some cases more, in
6	some cases less. Some were covered, some were
7	not.
8	Q. Which ones were you referring to in
9	this e-mail?
10	A. Lehman made good money out of
11	certainly some equity issuance there. There was
12	also at least one M&A deal that Lehman made
13	money on, and I was involved. He knew that I
14	was involved, a major Austrian company.
15	Q. Did he know that you were involved in
16	Formula One before sending this e-mail?
17	A. I do not know. I do not know.
18	Q. What about number two, the sale of
19	60,000 apartments for the Republic of Austria,
20	were those covered by an advisory services
21	agreement?
22	A. Those that specific assignment was
23	definitely covered. Yes, it was multiyear.
24	Generated something like a 10 million Euro fee
25	for Lehman.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Did Jeremy Isaacs respond to this
3	e-mail?
4	A. No, he did not.
5	Q. Did you have a telephone conversation
6	with Jeremy Isaacs after you sent this e-mail?
7	A. After this e-mail I do not believe
8	that I had one, no. I saw no reason.
9	Q. Have you discussed Formula One with
10	Jeremy Isaacs since July 4th, 2007?
11	A. Yes. You asked me earlier and I told
12	you that at some point I now believe before
13	launching the UK proceedings, I went to see him
14	with my evidence book.
15	DISCOVERY REQUEST
16	
17	MS. ALVAREZ: I would just like to
18	note for the record that Dr. Marsoner testified
19	that he reviewed the evidence book in
20	preparation for this deposition and we don't
21	have a copy, so we would call for its
22	production.
23	MR. VAN TOL: Consider your request.
24	I don't know if it was called for.
25	MS. ALVAREZ: Well, it's called for

1	MARSONER
2	now, and we'll follow up in correspondence.
3	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
4	Q. In this e-mail with Jeremy Isaacs you
5	mention that you thank him for his advice on
6	your little asset management project?
7	A. Hm-hmm.
8	Q. What was this asset management
9	project?
10	A. I had the idea to launch, and
11	ultimately did launch an enhanced index fund,
12	asset management approach, which I called
13	Indexceed Limited which is essentially the
14	strategy is essentially a passive strategy
15	slightly optimized around various edges which
16	gave certainly top quartile performance. I
17	spent a number of years on it, but I never
18	managed to raise any significant funds for it so
19	ultimately folded it again.
20	Q. Okay.
21	MS. ALVAREZ: We'll move on to the
22	next exhibit, then, which is Marsoner 157 to
23	158.
24	
25	

1	MARSONER
2	(Marsoner Exhibit 10, Two-page e-mail
3	chain bearing on the top of the first page an
4	e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Dan Schwarzmann,
5	dated Monday, December 3, 2012, and Bates
6	stamped Marsoner00000157 and 158, marked for
7	identification)
8	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
9	Q. This is being marked as Exhibit 10.
10	If you could take a look at it.
11	So this is an e-mail from you, Dr.
12	Marsoner, to Dan Schwarzmann at PwC. It's dated
13	December 3rd, 2012, and it looks like you are
14	forwarding to him an e-mail from Bruce Matthews
15	to you, or it's really an e-string between you
16	and Bruce Matthews in August 2009.
17	Do you see that?
18	A. Yes, I see that.
19	Q. Well, let's look at the original
20	e-mail which is actually on 158 the next page.
21	That e-mail is from you to Bruce
22	Matthews dated August 10, 2009. It reads: Who
23	at your shop oversees the Lehman investment in
24	the CVC group in Formula One, please? I have
25	had a fair amount to do with LB making that

1	MARSONER
2	investment and would like to just find out where
3	you stand on it so we can see if a project of
4	mutual interest could ensue.
5	Do you see that?
6	A. I see that, yes.
7	Q. Who is Bruce Matthews?
8	A. He was a colleague of mine on the
9	credit risk committee of Lehman Brothers Europe
10	Limited.
11	Q. Why did you send this e-mail to him?
12	A. Because he is an employee Alvarez &
13	Marsal.
14	Q. Why did you want to send this to an
15	employee of Alvarez & Marsal?
16	A. I suspected that Alvarez & Marsal
17	would have some involvement with the Lehman
18	investment in Formula One.
19	Q. Where was Bruce Matthews based, do you
20	know?
21	A. I believe in London, certainly at the
22	time I think he was based in London.
23	Q. Why would A&M have any involvement in
24	Lehman's investment in F1?
25	A. Because A&M were the what's it

1	MARSONER
2	called the administrator equivalent of Lehman
3	in the US.
4	Q. You say in the e-mail that you would
5	like to just find out where you stand on it to
6	see if a project of mutual interest could ensue.
7	What project of mutual interest are
8	you referring to?
9	A. There were a whole number that were
10	imaginable including, but not limited to selling
11	the stake again. And I will not I will not
12	hesitate to freely admit that a part of the
13	motivation of writing this e-mail was the same
14	motivation that led me to write the Isaacs
15	e-mail, the Bonacker e-mail, the Fuld
16	conversation, just make sure it was widely known
17	that around F1 and Lehman, my hat was in the
18	ring.
19	Q. Did you inform Bruce Matthews that you
20	expected to be paid for Formula One?
21	A. Again, revenues were a long way from
22	visible at the time. Just like with all the
23	other prepare-the-ground conversations, there
24	was nothing that I could charge my 10 percent
25	on.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Did you inform Bruce Matthews that you
3	eventually expected to be paid by Lehman when
4	revenues were realized?
5	A. I do not believe that I said that
6	explicitly at the time, just like I didn't say
7	it explicitly in all the other
8	prepare-the-ground communications.
9	Q. And Bruce Matthews responds: Happy to
10	introduce you to our guys responsible for the F1
11	position. Can you advise me what capacity you
12	have been involved and would consider being
13	involved so I can set that up properly?
14	Do you see that?
15	A. I see that, yes.
16	Q. Then you respond to that e-mail on
17	August 11, 2009, which is the same date, and you
18	respond: My involvement goes back to my
19	full-time years at Lehman pre-2002 when CVC
20	bought out BayernLB, my early understanding that
21	this deal was pre-agreed with all the key then
22	warring F1 parties was, I believe you say
23	related e-mails exist the original reason to
24	for LB to stay invested at that time. At this
25	stage I would like to help you guys maximize

1	MARSONER
2	value here.
3	How did you expect to help Lehman
4	maximize value?
5	A. Well, if Alvarez & Marsal had picked
6	up on this, there were a whole number of ways in
7	which I could have helped them since I really
8	knew the space better than most, just just
9	for example what I wrote here. I could have
10	helped them to sell it had they wanted to sell
11	it early, I could have helped them vis-a-vis
12	CVC.
13	There were a number of things that I
14	could have done in addition to what I already
15	had done in '05 which I obviously wanted to make
16	sure that they were I think I used the word
17	institutionally aware of.
18	Q. Did Bruce Matthews take you up on your
19	offer?
20	A. Absolutely not, nothing tangible ever
21	came back from either Bruce or Alvarez & Marsal.
22	Q. Then Bruce Matthews responds on August
23	13, 2009: That F1 guy is in the US. I was due
24	to go out next week and was going to brief him,
25	but then may postpone now, so I will get in

1	MARSONER
2	touch and introduce you.
3	Do you see that?
4	A. I see that, yes.
5	Q. Did you ever get in touch with the US
6	guys responsible for F1?
7	A. I do not even know his identity to
8	this day.
9	Q. Did you try and learn their or his
10	or her identity?
11	A. I think I followed up often enough
12	with Bruce Matthews to understand that they had
13	no interest in taking this forward with me.
14	Q. So you didn't follow up?
15	A. I followed up on a number of
16	occasions. So long as he was on the creditors
17	committee of LBEL, I asked him every time I saw
18	him.
19	Q. Did you at any point tell him:
20	Listen, I expect to be paid for this?
21	A. It was premature. It was premature.
22	There were no visible revenues at the time.
23	Q. And during your by the way, were
24	your follow-ups by e-mail?
25	A. Since I sent this to Dan Schwarzmann

1	MARSONER
2	who was the decision maker/administrator at
3	LBEL, I assume that this is that this is the
4	core of the relevant e-mail traffic.
5	Q. Dan Schwarzmann is the administrator
6	of Lehman Brothers Europe Limited?
7	A. Europe Limited, yes. He works for PwC
8	and is the senior administrator for LBEL.
9	Q. Okay. So in your conversations with
10	Bruce Matthews, what did he tell you about the
11	Formula One investment?
12	A. That it wasn't him. There was some
13	other guy he was going to produce which never
14	happened.
15	Q. Did he tell you why the guy was in the
16	US?
17	A. No, I didn't particularly I mean,
18	Alvarez & Marsal is a US firm so I wasn't
19	surprised that the guy would be in the US.
20	Q. So you didn't ask: Why is this guy in
21	the US dealing with a European investment?
22	A. It's a US firm. I did not know where,
23	upon reinvestment, the F1 stake was held. Could
24	have been in Europe, some island in between,
25	could have been the US. I did not know. I

1	MARSONER	
2	surmised that Alvarez & Marsal would have	
3	something to do with it and I surmised that they	
4	would want to talk to me. It turns out they did	
5	not.	
6	But revenues have not crystalized.	
7	Revenues crystalized in May of 2012, and I put	
8	my claim in August of 2012, and this is still	
9	the period during which I was hoping to come to	
10	a an agreement with Dan Schwarzmann of PwC	
11	and LBEL.	
12	So I shared with him a whole number of	
13	things that I thought were pertinent and that	
14	would show him that in fairness I was owed some	
15	money here.	
16	Q. Did you tell him that you were owed	
17	some money?	
18	A. To Dan Schwartzman?	
19	Q. Hm—hmm.	
20	A. Oh, very much. I put down a hundred	
21	million on the original claim in August and	
22	revised that to 150 million when I heard more	
23	data. Proof of claim is the name of that form	
24	and the very first one had a hundred million in	
25	it.	

1	MARSONER
2	Q. This is a proof of claim against
3	Lehman Brothers Europe Limited?
4	A. My contractual partner, yes.
5	Q. Why did you increase the claim from a
6	hundred million to 150 million?
7	A. Because I got more data on the on
8	the cash that had actually come out and on the
9	valuation that was reasonable.
10	Q. You ultimately settled this claim with
11	Lehman Brothers Europe, correct?
12	A. That is correct, yes.
13	MS. ALVAREZ: Let's just take a look
14	at it. It's Marsoner 217. We'll mark this
15	Exhibit 11.
16	(Marsoner Exhibit 11, Multipage
17	document entitled Consent Order, bearing the
18	hand-written date at the top of the page 19th
19	June, 2014, and Bates stamped Marsoner00000217
20	through 227, marked for identification)
21	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
22	Q. Dr. Marsoner, if you could just look
23	at Exhibit 11.
24	Is this a copy of the order approving
25	your settlement with Lehman Brothers Europe

1	MARSONER
2	Limited?
3	A. I believe it is.
4	Q. Attached to the order is the actual
5	settlement agreement, is that right?
6	A. That is correct.
7	Q. And the settlement is dated June 5,
8	2014?
9	A. That is so.
10	Q. How did it come to be that you settled
11	this claim?
12	A. I was advised by my QC, Gabriel Moss,
13	that my claim was very solid in substance, but
14	that it had the significant problem that the one
15	and a half billion dollars in profits that I was
16	basing my claim on was sitting outside the UK
17	jurisdiction. And the way UK bankruptcy law
18	works, it would have been exceedingly difficult
19	to enforce a positive verdict in this UK case
20	against a US entity.
21	Essentially, essentially here and
22	please forgive me, I am rapidly getting out of
23	my depth legally, but as I understood it, I had
24	a really good chance that the UK court would
25	ultimately say yes, you are owed your 10 percent

1	MARSONER
2	of the 1.5 billion, but so sorry Thomas, we
3	don't have the money here.
4	Q. When did your you say QC.
5	When did your QC advise you that the
6	profits were sitting outside of the UK
7	jurisdiction?
8	A. That wasn't that I don't
9	remember when, but in the course of the UK
10	proceeding, I forget when exactly that was,
11	there must be e-mails to that effect still, it
12	was the administrators, PwC administrators who
13	said: Look, we don't have the money here, it is
14	in the US, not in the UK.
15	Q. So this was prior prior to June 5,
16	2014, prior to
17	A. Yeah, very much, it was other than
18	generally not being a very litigious person, to
19	be honest, knowing that I had a good chance to
20	win this but that the victory would have a very
21	high risk of being an empty one was the single
22	most important consideration for me to settle
23	this at all and particularly to settle this at
24	so low a number.
25	Q. So at that point were you considering

1	MARSONER
2	filing a claim against the Lehman US entities?
3	A. Yes, of course.
4	MS. ALVAREZ: We can take a
5	two-minute
6	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 2:26
7	p.m. We are going off the record.
8	(Recess)
9	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins media
10	unit number four. The time is 2:40 p.m. and we
11	are back on the record.
12	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
13	Q. Dr. Marsoner, Lehman Brothers Holdings
14	Inc. filed for bankruptcy in September 15, 2008,
15	correct?
16	It was a very public filing, right,
17	the largest in history?
18	So you were aware when Lehman Brothers
19	Holdings filed for bankruptcy?
20	A. I was very aware when Lehman Brothers
21	Holdings Inc. filed for bankruptcy.
22	Q. You didn't file a claim against Lehman
23	Brothers Holdings Inc. by the bar date, correct?
24	A. I did not even know that a bar date
25	existed under US bankruptcy law. Under UK

1	MARSONER
2	bankruptcy law, LBEL we just received the new 4
3	billion Euro claim two weeks ago.
4	Q. So you didn't know a bar date existed
5	in the US?
6	A. No, I did not. I had never had any
7	dealings with US bankruptcy law before.
8	Q. Okay.
9	MS. ALVAREZ: We are going to mark a
10	document as an exhibit. Mark this as Exhibit
11	12.
12	(Marsoner Exhibit 12, Multipage
13	document entitled Lehman Brothers Europe Limited
14	- In Administration, Joint Administrators'
15	progress report for the period 23 September 2009
16	to 22 March 2010, dated 20 April 2010, and
17	bearing no Bates stamps, marked for
18	identification)
19	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
20	Q. This is a progress report filed by
21	Lehman Brothers Europe Limited in
22	administration. It says: Joint administrators'
23	progress report for the period September 23rd,
24	2009, to March 22, 2010, and the date of the
25	report is April 20, 2010.

1	MARSONER
2	Have you seen this report before?
3	A. I do not know.
4	Q. You testified earlier that you were on
5	the Creditors Committee of Lehman Brothers
6	Europe, correct?
7	A. That is correct, yes.
8	Q. In fact, if you look at page 2 of the
9	report, you are identified here as a member of
10	the Creditors Committee of Lehman Brothers
11	Europe.
12	Do you see that?
13	A. That is correct, yes, I can see that.
14	Q. If we flip to page 4, under
15	intercompany debtors, it states in a bullet
16	point: Submitted direct and guaranteed claims
17	into the estate of Lehman Brothers Holdings
18	Inc., totaling 1.4 billion by the prescribed bar
19	date.
20	Do you see that?
21	A. I can see that now, yes.
22	Q. So at the time, Lehman Brothers Europe
23	Limited had submitted a claim in LBHI's
24	bankruptcy by the bar date, correct?
25	A. That is what is written here. I would

1	MARSONER
2	not have understood the word "bar date."
3	Q. Was this discussed was the bar date
4	discussed among the Creditors Committee?
5	A. Absolutely not. I was this has
6	come up once before and I actually circulated
7	the minutes of the one Creditors Committee
8	meeting that took place during that first year
9	as I now know, and those minutes very clearly
10	show that nothing remotely approaching or
11	resembling a US bar date was discussed.
12	Q. How involved were you in the Creditors
13	Committee?
14	A. In the Creditors Committee at Lehman
15	Brothers Europe Limited I was very much
16	involved, yes. The focus of our work at the
17	time was to compensate PwC. I was very involved
18	in the negotiation to compensate PwC. I came up
19	with the idea of paying them a success fee which
20	has worked well for Lehman Brothers Europe
21	Limited, I believe.
22	And the other big topic we discussed
23	at the time was a relatively large pool of
24	assets that was sitting at JPMorgan, and it
25	wasn't entirely clear which Lehman entity had

1	MARSONER
2	the best claim on that.
3	Q. Now, \$1.4 billion is a significant
4	amount, significant claim that Lehman Brothers
5	Europe had against Lehman Brothers Holdings
6	Inc., correct?
7	A. Not necessarily. I mean, this is a
8	600 billion bankruptcy, and to this day,
9	literally to this day 10 billion tactical claims
10	are filed by one company on the other company
11	and back again. That was not the work of the
12	committee, that was the work of the
13	administrator.
14	Q. So the committee had no the
15	Creditors Committee had no interests in whether
16	the administrator filed a claim against Lehman
17	Brothers Holdings Inc.?
18	MR. VAN TOL: Could I have that read
19	back, please?
20	(Question read)
21	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form to
22	the extent you are asking this witness to
23	testify about what an entire committee thought.
24	You may answer.
25	A. It was absolutely not the focus of my
1	

1	MARSONER
2	work at the time on the committee. I told you
3	what the two focus areas were, compensating PwC
4	and finding out where the famous account 28
5	JPMorgan pledge matter stood. I was totally
6	focused on that.
7	What went on between LBEL and the US
8	back and forth I simply do not remember. It was
9	not anything I focused on at the time.
10	Q. Did you review these progress reports
11	that were put out by Lehman Brothers Europe?
12	A. The part that I reviewed was always
13	the last page.
14	Q. So you only reviewed the last page?
15	A. There is a lot of boilerplate in the
16	earlier pages that for the non-bankruptcy lawyer
17	and the nonpracticing lawyer are relatively
18	dark. Were then and are now.
19	Q. So you have never seen this before?
20	MR. VAN TOL: Objection, asked and
21	answered.
22	A. I think my most accurate answer which
23	I believe I have given before is the one that if
24	I did see it and I do not recall seeing this
25	paragraph at all if I had seen it, I

1	MARSONER
2	certainly wouldn't have understood it. I did
3	not know what the prescribed bar date meant.
4	Q. You never had discussions while you
5	were on the Creditors Committee about getting in
6	a claim at Lehman Brothers Holdings by a
7	prescribed deadline?
8	A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. As I
9	tried to say, it is a concept that is alien to
10	UK bankruptcy law.
11	Q. You filed a claim against Lehman
12	Brothers Inc., correct?
13	A. I presume that you are referring to my
14	currency collar, and in that context that is
15	correct, yes.
16	Q. And that claim you filed by the bar
17	date?
18	A. I have no idea when I filed it, and
19	whether there was or wasn't a bar date I do not
20	recall. The substance of this matter was that
21	it was a \$5 million currency collar where I had
22	money on a margin account and where there was a
23	risk that the collar would expire against me.
24	And so I was trying to make I was
25	trying to get a hundred thousand dollars over

Page 135

1 MARSONER 2 there that was -- that was sitting in this 3 margin account back. That's when I filed a 4 claim. 5 Q. Were you represented by counsel or did you file that on your own? 6 7 I filed that on my own. I was sent 8 paperwork. This was relatively simple. l did 9 involve counsel in that matter once, my Austrian 10 counsel, because I received a phone call at some 11 point from somebody at Lehman. Basically I 12 think that was after the expiration of the 13 collar. I believe it had expired \$200,000 or so 14 in the money against me. And there somebody 15 called me, I referred the matter to my Austrian 16 counsel who I think then wrote a personal letter 17 back. 18 Q. Did you receive a bar date notice from 19 Lehman Brothers Inc.? 20 A. I do not recall seeing a bar date 21 notice ever until my first conversations with 22 Hogan Lovells where I asked them to show me this 23 piece of paper. I looked at it and it has very 24 ugly, very big disclosure language at the bottom 25 that I have absolutely never seen before.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. How did you find that form?
3	A. These gentlemen gave it to me.
4	Q. In connection with your LBI claim,
5	your claim against the
6	A. Yeah, here, I was looking at
7	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
8	THE WITNESS: Sorry.
9	MR. VAN TOL: Repeat that. I think
10	you are getting confused.
11	Repeat that question, please.
12	MS. ALVAREZ: Just to clarify, he was
13	pointing to his attorneys. I don't know if
14	that's clear for the record.
15	(Record read).
16	MR. VAN TOL: Okay.
17	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
18	Q. How did you find the proof of claim
19	form that you submitted in LBI's case, the
20	actual proof of claim form?
21	A. LBEL.
22	Q. I'm sorry, Lehman Brothers Inc.?
23	THE WITNESS: Again, I'm sorry, this
24	is are we somewhere in attorney-client
25	privilege land where I should not digress here?

1	MARSONER
2	MR. VAN TOL: If you are just
3	testifying about where you got a form you can
4	say, but don't divulge any advice you were given
5	about such a form.
6	A. I believe so forgive me, this is
7	alien territory for me. Obviously on the on
8	the US claim, as one would expect, I have relied
9	on my US attorneys.
10	Is that something I can say?
11	Q. Sure. I'm confused because you
12	testified that you handled this claim on your
13	own, that you did it yourself.
14	A. No, no, that was the previous one, the
15	one with the currency collar. There I was
16	sent I mean, this came in the mail in the
17	currency, because very easy to fill in.
18	MR. VAN TOL: That's why I asked the
19	questions read back. We have got our entities
20	messed up between LBI and LCC and others.
21	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay.
22	MR. VAN TOL: This firm did not
23	represent Dr. Marsoner in connection with this
24	currency collar claim.
25	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay.

1	MARSONER
2	THE WITNESS: With my hundred thousand
3	dollar margin account balance, that
4	MS. ALVAREZ: Got it.
5	THE WITNESS: That I did myself.
6	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
7	Q. And that claim was against which
8	entity?
9	A. I believe it was against LBCC.
10	Q. Okay. Here we go.
11	So, then, you were represented by
12	counsel in connection with your claim against
13	Lehman Brothers Inc.?
14	A. No, I was not. I was not. I thought
15	that I had filled in the right piece of paper to
16	get my margin account money back from LBCC. The
17	reason I thought that whether the paperwork I
18	filled in at the time was headed LBCC or LB Inc.
19	was immaterial because my broker with whom I
20	entered into this LBCC currency collar was LB
21	Inc.
22	Q. Okay. So, then, with regard to LBCC,
23	did you receive a bar date notice from LBCC?
24	A. I don't think I ever got anything from
25	LBCC which is why I filled in the LBI paperwork

MARSONER to get my LBCC margin balance back. Q. I want to ask you about a couple of addresses. Do you recognize the address and I may not pronounce these right, I probably won't Casa Andreas 16 Trig Sant Adrija Lija BLZ10 Morocco. Do you recognize that address? A. Well, absolutely not. That is
Q. I want to ask you about a couple of addresses. Do you recognize the address and I may not pronounce these right, I probably won't Casa Andreas 16 Trig Sant Adrija Lija BLZ10 Morocco. Do you recognize that address? A. Well, absolutely not. That is
addresses. Do you recognize the address — and I may not pronounce these right, I probably won't — Casa Andreas 16 Trig Sant Adrija Lija BLZ10 Morocco. Do you recognize that address? A. Well, absolutely not. That is
Do you recognize the address — and I may not pronounce these right, I probably won't — Casa Andreas 16 Trig Sant Adrija Lija BLZ10 Morocco. Do you recognize that address? A. Well, absolutely not. That is
may not pronounce these right, I probably won't Casa Andreas 16 Trig Sant Adrija Lija BLZ10 Morocco. Do you recognize that address? A. Well, absolutely not. That is
won't Casa Andreas 16 Trig Sant Adrija Lija BLZ10 Morocco. Do you recognize that address? A. Well, absolutely not. That is
BLZ10 Morocco. Do you recognize that address? A. Well, absolutely not. That is
Do you recognize that address? A. Well, absolutely not. That is
A. Well, absolutely not. That is
definitely a nonexisting address because it has
elements of the Maltese address that is on my
'04 agreement, but it obviously also has the
country Morocco that is relatively far away from
Malta.
Q. So let's focus on the Maltese address.
What is that an address to?
MR. VAN TOL: Objection, asked and
answered. You may answer again.
A. That's the address of the house of a
friend of mine in Malta.
Q. Okay.
A. Where I happened to be once in the '04
time period.
Q. Do you know if a bar date notice

1	MARSONER
2	arrived at that house?
3	A. I never got anything from that house.
4	I used, as I described to you, as a non-UK,
5	non-Austrian address for pure tax cosmetics
6	purposes.
7	Q. Does your friend still live in that
8	house?
9	A. I do not know. I do not know if he
10	still owns it.
11	Q. Do you recognize the address Casa
12	Peliganos, Costa Keretas? Do you recognize that
13	as an address?
14	A. That I recognize. That is a house
15	that at one point I had rented in Mexico for a
16	three-week family holiday.
17	Q. Did you use that address on any
18	contracts with Lehman Brothers?
19	A. I'm not sure that I used it on any
20	contract, but I would assume that I or rather my
21	secretary must have put it on an invoice or two
22	that I probably sent sent to Lehman, where,
23	again, for tax cosmetic purposes I preferred a
24	non-UK, non-Austrian address.
25	Q. Okay. What about the address Casa

1	MARSONER
2	Carrion Parco, San Giacomo?
3	Do you recognize that?
4	A. That's the address of a holiday flat
5	of my then of my father's, only Garda in
6	northern Italy.
7	Q. Did you ever stay there?
8	A. I occasionally stayed there for
9	periods never exceeding a few days and only
10	during the summer. No mail is received there.
11	There is not even a mailbox or a there is not
12	even a sort of a slit in the door where one
13	could put mail in because it would be pointless.
14	Q. Did you ever include that address on
15	any contracts with Lehman Brothers?
16	A. I do not believe I put that on a
17	contract but, again, I may well have put it on
18	an invoice.
19	If I was in the general area at the
20	time, I might well have told my assistant for
21	the often enough discussed tax cosmetic purposes
22	to put that address on the invoice.
23	Q. Does your father still own that flat?
24	A. My father had two flats in that house
25	which a year ago he gave to his two sons.

_	
1	MARSONER
2	Q. Are you one of those sons?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Who lives there now?
5	A. Nobody lives there now. Those are
6	still holiday flats that get used in the summer
7	occasionally. In my case practically not
8	because I have a summer house on an Austrian
9	lake, Lake Millstatt where my wife is from, and
10	so the flat of those two flats that I own
11	generally gets used for guests that my brother
12	has.
13	Q. When did your father give you that
14	flat?
15	A. About a year ago.
16	Q. So in 2009 it still belonged to your
17	father?
18	A. Absolutely.
19	Q. Do you know if you ever received a bar
20	date notice at that address?
21	A. I have never seen any mail received at
22	either of those flats.
23	MS. ALVAREZ: I think this might be a
24	good time for a break.
25	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 3:03

1	MARSONER
2	
3	p.m. We are going off the record. (Recess)
4	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 3:32
5	p.m. We are back on the record.
6	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
7	Q. Dr. Marsoner, I would like to turn
8	back to what's been marked as Exhibit 10. This
9	is the e-mail string between you and Bruce
10	Matthews?
11	A. Yeah.
12	Q. You testified earlier that you had
13	e-mailed Bruce Matthews about Formula One
14	because he was at A&M?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. You also testified that he was on the
17	Creditors Committee of Lehman Brothers Europe,
18	correct?
19	A. Europe Limited, yes.
20	Q. In what capacity did he serve on the
21	Creditors Committee?
22	A. I presume that he represented one of
23	the US entities, but I'm not certain that it was
24	that. The reason you see me hesitate is that
25	the cast of characters from A&M has changed over

Page 144

MARSONER 1 2 Bruce Matthews has been out of the 3 picture for quite a few years now and -- so I 4 assume it was one of the US entities, but I 5 cannot be certain of that. So you e-mailed Bruce Matthews -- you 6 7 sent him this e-mail in Exhibit 10 because you believed he was on the Creditors Committee 8 9 representing one of the US entities? 10 A. I knew he was on the Creditors Committee because he and I coordinated carefully 11 12 around the question of how do we compensate PwC. We've developed a good working relationship with 13 14 each other on that committee. 15 And as an Alvarez & Marsal person, as an administrator to Lehman, I thought there had 16 17 to be somebody at his shop involved in or 18 overseeing the Formula One investment. I 19 couldn't be certain then that that was a US 20 person or not a US person. I guess the balance 21 of probabilities was that it would be a US 22 person, but I could certainly not be certain of 23 that. 24 Q. What I'm trying to understand is why 25 did you think there was someone at his shop

1	MARSONER	
2	watching over this investment?	
3	A. Because there were two shops that were	
4	overlooking Lehman. In Europe it was PwC.	
5	Pretty sure that I would have asked the same	
6	question to one of the PwC people who told me	
7	not us, so since there were only two	
8	administrators to my then knowledge involved, I	
9	assumed it had to be somewhere in the Alvarez &	
10	Marsal ambit.	
11	MS. ALVAREZ: I think we can mark the	
12	next exhibit. This is labeled Marsoner 32 to	
13	41. I believe this is Exhibit 13.	
14	(Marsoner Exhibit 13, Multipage	
15	document bearing on the first page an e-mail	
16	from Tom Bernard to Thomas Marsoner, dated	
17	December 12, 2014, and Bates stamped	
18	Marsoner00000032 through 41, marked for	
19	identification)	
20	20 BY MS. ALVAREZ:	
21	Q. Exhibit 13 is labeled Marsoner 32	
22	through Marsoner 41. If you take a look, it's	
23	an e-mail string between you and Tom Bernard.	
24	Now, there are various e-mails here,	
25	some may be in order, some may be out of order,	

1	MARSONER
2	it's a little bit confusing, but what I would
3	like to discuss with you first is on Marsoner
4	34.
5	Here this is an e-mail halfway
6	about the middle of the page is an e-mail from
7	you to Tom Bernard dated December 7, 2014, and
8	the subject line is shared history.
9	Do you see that?
10	A. Yes, I see that.
11	Q. You say in the I'll say third
12	paragraph in the middle of the paragraph: I'd
13	love to catch up with you at your convenience
14	for half an hour at some point in the next few
15	months primarily to chat about Formula One
16	wherever convenient for you, New York, Rockies
17	or London.
18	Do you see that?
19	A. I see that, yes.
20	Q. What with regard to Formula One did
21	you want to discuss with Tom Bernard?
22	A. The Peter Sherratt allegation in the
23	e-mail that you shared with Peter Sherratt in
24	which he had written that Christian and Tom, Tom
25	Bernard, agreed with his notion that I had no

1	MARSONER
2	claim.
3	Q. Were you able to schedule a meeting
4	with Tom Bernard?
5	A. No, I ended up only being able to
6	speak to him on the phone and exchange a few
7	e-mails, all of which you have.
8	Q. What did you discuss on the telephone
9	with him?
10	A. Very much I told him very openly
11	that what I wrote here, that I was a little
12	bit troubled and so it did he really say
13	that he thought that I had no claim, and his
14	response was that he, of course, did not say
15	that. He knew I was a paid advisor, he didn't
16	know more, he didn't know less was essentially
17	the substance of it.
18	Q. Did he say anything about whether he
19	thought you should be paid for Formula One?
20	A. You know, ultimately, as you know, I
21	gave him a sort of suggestion of what he could
22	write, and ultimately he wrote something that
23	is you know, that I would characterize as
24	being middle of the road along the lines of the
25	Peter Sherratt allegation that Bernard agrees

1	MARSONER
2	that I should not be paid, certainly a notion
3	that he did not share. But at the same time he
4	pointed out to me in those conversations that
5	while he was aware of the fact that I was a paid
6	advisor, he was not in charge of the Lehman
7	relationship with me.
8	Q. Okay. Just looking through these
9	e-mails, if you look at Marsoner 33 there is an
10	e-mail from you to Tom Bernard dated December 9,
11	2014, and it says: In preparation for our call
12	later this week, please find enclosed my best
13	estimate of the 1.5 billion or so F1 profit that
14	I think we both materially contributed to.
15	Do you see that?
16	A. Yes, I see that.
17	Q. Was this did you send this e-mail
18	before you had that call with him that you
19	just the call that you just described?
20	A. I believe so, yes. I believe so.
21	Q. You say: Please find enclosed my best
22	estimate.
23	What was attached to this e-mail?
24	A. The landscape analysis that you have
25	that shows that before bankruptcy, Lehman had

1	MARSONER
2	put in 300, got out 312, and then since
3	bankruptcy Lehman made about a billion five of
4	which a little less than half in cash and a
5	little more than half fair value of the stock.
6	Q. When you spoke to Bernard, did you
7	discuss that landscape analysis?
8	A. You see the his e-mail up there in
9	which he responds. I certainly I certainly
10	would have explained it to him, yes.
11	Q. What did he say about it?
12	A. Just factual, just what it says, just
13	what I just said in terms of what the net firm
14	revenues would Lehman made out of F1 most
15	probably amounted to by now.
16	Q. In this e-mail, and I'm referring to
17	the December 9 e-mail from you to Tom Bernard
18	that we were just talking about, you say: Since
19	you were in many ways even closer than me to the
20	situation, you may have better information.
21	What did you mean by that statement?
22	A. You know, I wanted to establish a
23	factual base for the discussion of what has
24	happened since he and I last spoke and and
25	particularly after '05, both Pignatti and my

1	MADSONED
1	MARSONER
2	involvement had been very slight.
3	I assumed he might still know more
4	about it, but no particular agenda, just
5	establishing establishing a factual base on
6	which to discuss the matter.
7	Q. And then Tom Bernard responds on
8	September 12: Hi, Thomas, this is way more
9	information than I have.
10	What is Tom Bernard referring to
11	there?
12	A. The landscape analysis. Particularly
13	he did not have the '012 numbers which he had
14	moved out of that whole thing since he got fired
15	in '09. What I had gleaned from public sources
16	had happened in '012 he was not actively aware.
17	MR. VAN TOL: For the record, I think
18	you said September. It's December 2014.
19	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay. Yeah, I see that.
20	Q. So during this time when you were
21	exchanging e-mails with Tom Bernard and you had
22	a telephone conversation with him, did he say
23	anything about Lehman agreeing to compensate you
24	10 percent of revenues for F1?
25	A. Tom Bernard very clearly made the

1	MARSONER
2	point that he knew I was a paid advisor, he knew
3	that I had pertinent and useful F1 knowledge,
4	but my relationship with the firm had never been
5	his business.
6	I think he has been very clear on
7	that, certainly throughout the phone
8	conversations that I had with him, and I think
9	that's also what the letter that he kindly
10	ultimately submitted says.
11	Q. So he wouldn't know are you saying
12	he wouldn't know whether Lehman had agreed to
13	compensate you for F1?
14	A. He knew he always told me he knew I
15	was a paid advisor and he knew that my F1
16	knowledge was very pertinent, and he actually
17	he very kindly repeated essentially what he had
18	written in the e-mail at the time, both to me
19	and internally to the team that worked on it.
20	But beyond that, he said,
21	understandably, that he was not involved in the
22	details of the Lehman relationship with me.
23	MS. ALVAREZ: Let's mark the next
24	exhibit, and this is Marsoner 42 to 43.
25	

1	MARSONER
2	(Marsoner Exhibit 14, Single-page
3	e-mail from Tom Bernard to Thomas Marsoner,
4	dated February 3, 2015, with single-page
5	attachment, Bates stamped Marsoner00000042 and
6	43, marked for identification)
7	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
8	Q. This is an e-mail from Tom Bernard to
9	Tom Marsoner dated February 3rd, 2014.
10	Attached to the e-mail appears to be a
11	draft letter to the Southern District of New
12	York Bankruptcy Court.
13	Do you see that?
14	A. Yeah, I see that.
15	Q. Is this a copy of the letter that you
16	had prepared for Tom Bernard?
17	A. I don't know. I mean, I certainly
18	remember making a convenience draft available to
19	him. I mean, it was very kind of him to take
20	the time to talk to me in the first place, so I
21	tried to lighten his load as much as I could.
22	And just like in all other cases, l
23	told him no pride of authorship, please write
24	whatever you feel correctly reflects reality.
25	What exactly he did or whether there were more

1	MARSONER	
2	than one draft, I do not recall.	
3	Q. Do you recall if he made any he edits	
4	to the draft that you sent him?	
5	A. I assume he would made edits, yes.	
6	Q. Did you have a conversation with him	
7	about the edits he was making?	
8	A. I may well have, but as in all cases	
9	under our e-mails, I think from me to Pignatti,	
10	Magnoni, where I always explicitly said please	
11	write only what you are comfortable with, the	
12	decision was always entirely that of the person	
13	3 who wrote it.	
14	Q. What did he say about the edits he was	
15	making to the letter?	
16	A. I don't remember what he said about	
17	any specifics.	
18	Q. If you look at this e-mail from Tom	
19	Bernard to you, the subject line reads: Does	
20	O this work?	
21	Do you know what he's referring to?	
22	A. Yeah, whether that would be a helpful	
23	statement to counteract the, as he agreed,	
24	incorrect claim by Sherratt that Tom agreed that	
25	I deserved nothing.	

Page 154

MARSONER 1 2 Q. Did you have a follow-up conversation with Tom Bernard after he sent you this draft? 3 4 Α. I -- I do not remember that detail. 5 The draft that ultimately he signed and sent in was the one he was comfortable with. 6 7 exactly he came up with that and whether we 8 discussed it once or twice, I do not recollect. 9 In some ways, to be honest, most 10 urgent thing for me was to really have the --11 that huge sentence on the record above his 12 E-mails are e-mails, but this is a signature. 13 real letter in which he specifically says that 14 he wrote that. 15 I also got a chuckle out of the fact 16 that the spelling of McLaren has remained the 17 same since the outset, so in many ways my -- my 18 main objective here -- looking for fairness 19 here, and for Tom Bernard to really repeat that 20 very material e-mail exchange in a letter served 21 the main purpose that I was after. 22 Q. Let's take a look back at Exhibit 13. 23 If you look at Marsoner 36 --24 A. I'm sorry? 25 Marsoner 36. Q.

1	MARSONER
2	A. 36?
3	Q. Yes. If you look at the e-mail in the
4	center of the page, it's an e-mail from you to
5	Tom Bernard dated February 2nd, 2015.
6	Do you see that?
7	A. Hm-hmm.
8	Q. You say to Tom Bernard: Because your
9	text ("When the F1 team at Lehman learned of
10	BLB's sale of its stake to CVC, our immediate
11	unanimous reaction was that the price was far
12	too low") otherwise reads like I had nothing to
13	do with realization that it was too low. In the
14	proper sequencing it is what it is, material.
15	Can you explain what you meant by
16	this?
17	A. I think what I meant by this has
18	become completely clear in discovery when your
19	client produced the e-mail in which Tom Bernard
20	turned around and sent my e-mail to the entire
21	team at the point in time when the price was not
22	known and said: If true, what Thomas is saying
23	is huge.
24	So in the proper sequencing that I was
25	looking for here, and which he kindly agreed to

1	MARSONER
2	reflect in his letter, it was clear that my call
3	was the first. He correctly diagnosed it as
4	huge. He told the team that he is almost fully
5	resolved to stay in, and when they then also saw
6	the press, it was easy to reach the decision to
7	stay in.
8	So this was a factual comment on the
9	correct sequencing and he kindly agreed with the
10	factual comment.
11	Q. And this text in parenthesis was
12	sentence that Tom Bernard had added to the draft
13	letter?
14	A. I think that's yeah. I would
15	assume that that is that that is something
16	that he drafted, yes.
17	Q. Do you know if that sentence remained
18	in the final letter?
19	A. I believe so, I believe it's at the
20	end.
21	Q. As you know, Vittorio Pignatti and
22	Ruggero Magnoni also submitted letters to the
23	bankruptcy court, correct?
24	A. Yeah.
25	Q. They also made themselves available to

1	MARSONER	
2 be deposed in L	ondon, correct?	
3 A. Yes,	correct.	
4 Q. Did y	ou ask Tom Bernard whether he was	
5 willing to be d	leposed?	
6 A. Tom B	Bernard in my phone conversations	
7 with him said t	hat if there was any way he could	
8 be spared a dep	osition he would be most	
9 grateful.		
10 Q. Did y	ou ask despite that statement,	
11 did you ask him	whether he would make himself	
12 available?		
13 A. No.	No, in every single case, when	
14 people either g	gave me no answer or told me	
15 please leave me	alone with this even though you	
16 are right, as i	n the case of Christian Meissner,	
17 I respected the	eir wishes. I mean, it's very	
18 kind of Tom to	kind of Tom to even have spent the time to	
19 write to wri	write to write the letter he wrote. To	
20 further impose	further impose upon him I wouldn't have	
21 thought I wo	thought I wouldn't have thought right.	
22 MS. A	LVAREZ: Well, let's take a look	
23 at we will m	mark this Exhibit 15.	
24		
25		

1	MARSONER
2	(Marsoner Exhibit 15, Two-page e-mail
3	chain bearing at the top of the first page an
4	e-mail from Christian Meissner to Thomas
5	Marsoner, dated January 28, 2015, with
6	single-page attachment, Bates stamped
7	Marsoner000000624 through 626, marked for
8	identification)
9	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
10	Q. I'll need your help with this one
11	because it's in German.
12	A. Sure.
13	Q. So Exhibit 15 is marked on the bottom
14	right-hand side Marsoner 624 to 626. It is an
15	e-mail string between you and Christian Meissner
16	in January of 2015.
17	Do you see that?
18	A. Yes, I see that.
19	Q. We have already discussed who
20	Christian Meissner is so we won't go there
21	again.
22	Why did you reach out to it appears
23	attached to this e-mail is a draft letter to the
24	court to be signed by Christian Meissner.
25	Is this a draft letter that you sent

1	MARSONER
2	to Mr. Meissner?
3	A. Yes, absolutely.
4	Q. Why did you send him this draft?
5	A. Because Peter Sherratt in the e-mail
6	that you made him read out during his deposition
7	had made the claim that Christian Meissner and
8	Tom Bernard agreed with him that I deserved
9	nothing.
10	Christian is a good friend of mine.
11	Very first thing I did when I read that e-mail,
12	somewhat in shock, I picked up the phone and
13	said: Christian, guess what e-mail just got?
14	What happened?
15	So he said: Ah, yes, there were
16	there was a call from Linklaters, and I forget,
17	I sat down with them or I got on the phone with
18	them, and I told them that the F1 matter
19	predated my aegis. "Meine agide" was the German
20	exact word. So it predates my time in charge of
21	European investment banking.
22	He then went on to say that Linklaters
23	tried in various different ways to get him to
24	say that him not knowing about it must mean that
25	Marsoner has no claim, to which Christian told

1	MARSONER
2	me very specifically that he told Linklaters
3	very specifically no, that is not what it means.
4	It means it predates my time, and I was simply
5	not involved with Marsoner on F1 matters.
6	So that my take on the e-mail by Peter
7	Sherratt to me is that in the case of Meissner
8	for sure it is a straight misrepresentation.
9	Q. Okay.
10	A. And that straight misrepresentation I
11	wanted to get to the bottom of and to crystalize
12	matters with Christian. This is the this is
13	the correspondence that followed between
14	Christian and me. And I believe I've already
15	said what the main point was.
16	Q. Well, if you look at Marsoner 625, the
17	e-mail is from you to Christian Meissner dated
18	January 14th, 2015?
19	A. Yeah.
20	Q. It says it starts off: Further to
21	my voice mail.
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. What did that voice mail concern?
24	A. I believe this matter.
25	Q. What did you say in the voice mail?

	MADONED.
1	MARSONER
2	A. A shorter version of what I wrote
3	here.
4	Q. Can you explain it to me?
5	A. Ah, sure. Should I try to
6	Q. You don't need to translate it word
7	for word, I just want to get a general
8	understanding of what the voice mail was about.
9	A. Basically I am basically telling
10	him here I have settled the UK case amicably,
11	relatively cheaply. Main argument, as I said
12	earlier today, that the 1.5 billion had accrued
13	in the US and the UK estate cannot pay out
14	revenues in the US.
15	But then I realized that I had a case
16	in the US, particularly because the claims bar
17	date of end 2002 has never been served upon me.
18	In the UK proceedings, the other side has
19	bothered you and Tom Bernard and then passed on
20	your statements very selectively in an effort to
21	avoid that this time I'd like to ask you to
22	please have a look at the enclosed draft letter,
23	corrected where and however you think necessary,
24	and to please then send me a scanned version of
25	your final version.

1	MARSONER
2	I would then pass it on to the New
3	York bankruptcy court. I have well understood
4	that it is your understandable preference to
5	have as little as possible to do with any
6	litigation, but against the background, how much
7	your statement, as you recall, was falsified by
8	the other side, I think that you might minimize
9	your involvement by making very clear from the
10	beginning what you were not dealing with.
11	Additionally you would help me with this and I
12	would be very grateful.
13	In case you have any interest I would,
14	of course, happily send you my motion to the New
15	York bankruptcy court.
16	Q. Thank you.
17	A. That's my best effort at an English
18	translation of my German.
19	Q. So you mentioned that his statements
20	were passed on, I think you said selectively in
21	the UK proceedings.
22	What did you mean by that?
23	A. I beg your pardon?
24	Q. At one point maybe we can look at
25	your exact language you said in the UK

1	MARSONER
2	proceedings the other side has bothered you and
3	Tom Bernard, and then passed on your statements
4	very selectively?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. What did you mean by that?
7	A. That Peter Sherratt was either
8	Peter Sherratt or Linklaters were
9	misrepresenting what Tom Bernard and Christian
10	Meissner had said. I just worded it politely
11	and carefully.
12	Q. Okay. I see that Christian Meissner
13	responded here by e-mail, but did you have a
14	conversation with him about this on the phone?
15	A. Not on this occasion, no, it was when
16	I first got the Sherratt e-mail with the
17	misrepresentation, then he and I had a
18	conversation on the phone. I was a little
19	upset, but he was very clear. And this was
20	essentially to crystalize matters one more time.
21	And then he says: Thank you for the
22	e-mail, I'm sorry that we have not spoken yet.
23	Davos this annual bigwig gathering Davos
24	and yearend bonus process are a difficult
25	combination.

1	MARSONER
2	Then he says the decisive sentence:
3	To that letter, although it is really
4	unproblematic, I would rather not get involved.
5	I do not believe that I want to be on the radar
6	screen of a US court to Lehman topics, and don't
7	want to sort of essentially be bothered with
8	process and depositions, could lead into other
9	topics I have had in other contexts.
10	He implies unhappy experiences with
11	Lehman topics and wants to gain as much distance
12	to Lehman as possible. I hope you understand
13	that. Happy to talk. Cordial regards,
14	Christian.
15	Q. Okay. Thank you.
16	Did you respond to this e-mail?
17	A. I believe I did. I think I told him:
18	Perfectly okay. Just if you can't testify for
19	me, then please stay out of it altogether, or
20	something to that effect.
21	Q. Okay.
22	DISCOVERY REQUEST
23	
24	MS. ALVAREZ: I don't believe we have
25	this e-mail, so to the extent we don't have it

	1 MARSONER
	we call for its production.
;	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
'	Q. Did you have a conversation with
;	Christian Meissner about F1 after January 28,
	5 2015?
	7 A. I do not think so. And this is an
;	e-mail that I may have only composed in my head.
	I'll look it up. Or I may have composed it and
1	decided not to send it. I'll look for it. I'll
1	look for it. But the substance is he says this
1:	letter is unproblematic, and I certainly when
1	he made clear he did not want to get involved, l
1.	didn't bother him with it any more.
1:	DISCOVERY REQUEST
1	6
1	7 MS. ALVAREZ: I will say that even if
18	B it's a draft e-mail that's sitting on your
1	computer, we would call for its production.
2	THE WITNESS: I will absolutely look
2	1 for it.
2:	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you.
2	The next document I would like to mark
2	4 is the letter that Pignatti submitted to the
2	

1	MARSONER
2	(Marsoner Exhibit 16, Two-page letter
3	from Vittorio Pignatti Morano to Judge Chapman,
4	United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern
5	District of New York, dated January 7, 2015, and
6	bearing no Bates stamps, marked for
7	identification)
8	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
9	Q. Is this the letter that Vittorio
10	Pignatti submitted to the bankruptcy court that
11	you referenced earlier?
12	A. I believe so, yes.
13	Q. How did it come to be that Mr.
14	Pignatti submitted a letter to the court?
15	A. I asked him to please do so. He had
16	already submitted one in the UK proceeding.
17	Q. Did you prepare this letter?
18	A. I, as in the two other cases, prepared
19	a convenience draft for him inviting him to mark
20	it up in whatever way he felt like it.
21	Q. And did he mark it up?
22	A. I believe he did, yes. I believe he
23	did.
24	Q. Do you recall what his edits were?
25	A. I do not remember the details of he

1	MARSONER
2	was perfectly fine. The end product was, you
3	know, perfectly fine and totally supportive. I
4	was very happy with it.
5	Q. Do you recall how many drafts were
6	exchanged?
7	A. I believe that in the Pignatti case I
8	don't think there was there was an exchange.
9	I believe it took him a little bit to put pen to
10	paper, but what he then submitted he submitted,
11	and I do not believe that I commented on his
12	draft.
13	I can't be absolutely certain, but my
14	best recollection is that I gave him a
15	convenience copy, he marked it up however he
16	wanted to, and the end product was perfectly
17	fine and very supportive.
18	MS. ALVAREZ: We are going to mark
19	another document.
20	(Marsoner Exhibit 17, Multipage e-mail
21	chain bearing at the top of the first page an
22	e-mail from Vittorio Pignatti to Thomas
23	Marsoner, dated December 4, 2002, with multipage
24	attachment, Bates stamped Marsoner 00000008
25	through 31, marked for identification)

Page 168

1 MARSONER 2 BY MS. ALVAREZ: 3 Q. This document was produced by you, Dr. 4 Marsoner, and it's marked Marsoner 8 through 5 Marsoner 31. It is a compilation of e-mails 6 between you and Mr. Pignatti. 7 What I would like you to focus on is 8 if you turn to the top of Marsoner 20, it 9 actually starts on the way bottom of Marsoner 19 10 to the top of 20, and it is an e-mail from you to Vittorio Pignatti with Ruggero Magnoni cc'd 11 12 dated January 14, 2015. 13 Do you see that? 14 A. Sorry, that is on 18 or 19? 15 It starts on the bottom of 19? Q. Starts on the bottom of 19. Okay. 16 A. 17 Q. You see how --18 A. It's from me to Pignatti, cc Magnoni. 19 Q. Yeah, you got it. 20 A. Right? 21 Q. You got it. 22 Yeah. A. 23 Q. So in the very first paragraph you 24 inform Pignatti, you say: I have decided to 25 pursue a claim in respect of the LB F1 matters.

1	MARSONER
2	Do you see that?
3	A. I see that, yes.
4	Q. Then in the second paragraph you
5	state: With reference to our discussions around
6	this, I would be very grateful if you could
7	please look at the draft letter attached, check
8	to confirm it reflects reality accurately, mark
9	it up wherever you think it might not and send a
10	scanned version back to me.
11	Do you see that?
12	A. Yes, I see that.
13	Q. When you say "with reference to our
14	discussions," what discussions are you referring
15	to?
16	A. I think I'm referring to discussions
17	with him all the way back to 2002. Pignatti and
18	I have had tons of discussions around F1
19	matters.
20	Q. Prior to sending him this e-mail, had
21	you informed him that you were pursuing a claim
22	with regard to F1?
23	A. For sure, because he kindly also wrote
24	the supported letter to the in the UK case.
25	Q. Prior to sending him this e-mail, had

1	MARSONER
2	you informed him that you were pursuing a claim
3	against the US entities with regard to F1?
4	A. I do not know. I do not know whether
5	I I may well have called him ahead and left
6	him a voice mail.
7	Q. But you don't recall if you had that
8	conversation with him about it?
9	A. I absolutely do not recall whether I
10	had a conversation with him about it, no.
11	Q. You say in this e-mail that there is a
12	draft letter attached.
13	Was this the first time that you sent
14	him a draft letter regarding a draft letter
15	to be submitted to the bankruptcy court?
16	A. I just see on the page 19 resending as
17	discussed, so I would that was on the 28th of
18	January, so I would assume that whether the
19	draft was sent to me on the 14th of January
20	was with us such draft that I sent him.
21	Q. Do you have a copy of this draft, the
22	first draft that you sent him?
23	A. I have certainly given it together
24	with all other relevant correspondence to
25	counsel on or about August 1 as I now recall.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. So to your knowledge, this draft was
3	produced to Lehman Brothers?
4	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
5	Calls for knowledge he may not have.
6	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
7	Q. I said to your knowledge was it
8	produced to Lehman Brothers?
9	A. I have forwarded to my lawyers so that
10	they would forward it to Lehman Brothers, yes,
11	of course.
12	DISCOVERY REQUEST
13	
14	MS. ALVAREZ: It's not clear to me
15	that we have this particular draft, so to the
16	extent we don't have it, we call for its
17	production.
18	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
19	Q. So, now, let's look at Pignatti's
20	response which is actually Marsoner 19, on
21	Marsoner 19. It is an e-mail from Pignatti to
22	you dated January 31, 2015.
23	Do you see do you see that?
24	A. I see that, yes. And I remember it.
25	I was a little bit shocked when I got it.
i	

4	
1	MARSONER
2	Q. Okay. It states: Dear Thomas, I
3	can't sign, risking perjury, sign a statement
4	that presents facts that I was not involved with
5	like the matters related to the sale of CVC of
6	LB's stake in Formula One. People who were
7	involved have a different recollection and if
8	asked by the court will air it. Not sure if
9	there is much upside for you but I do see some
10	downside. Sorry. V.
11	What specifically did you find
12	shocking?
13	A. That he would think that I would even
14	dream of asking him to risk perjury.
15	Q. Did you have a further conversation
16	with him about what he meant by that?
17	A. Yeah, I made I mean, I made very
18	clear to him what I have always made very clear
19	that he should please only write what he really
20	remembered and what he felt comfortable with.
21	I'm absolutely certain that I cleared up his
22	misunderstanding that risking perjury was
23	anywhere in the realm of the possible or
24	desired.
25	Q. Did Pignatti send you a revised draft?

1	MARSONER
2	A. This is a an e-mail by him to his
3	assistant on page number 20 where he instructs
4	his secretary to send to basically .pdf his
5	text which is down here, Dear Judge Chapman, all
6	the way to it was my understanding that Marsoner
7	would have been paid by Lehman Brothers for his
8	services concerning the F1 investment or I would
9	not have asked him to help.
10	He certainly did not elicit any
11	comments of mine on this text of his. He copied
12	me on his instruction to his secretary to .pdf
13	it and use his stamped signature.
14	So I made a suggestion. He reworded
15	it however he felt fit and kindly submitted it.
16	Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr.
17	Pignatti about the edits that he made to the
18	letter?
19	A. No. No. The letter is perfectly
20	fine.
21	MS. ALVAREZ: Let's take a look at
22	Marsoner 622 through 623.
23	
24	
25	
İ	

1	MARSONER
2	(Marsoner Exhibit 18, Two-page letter
3	from Vittorio Pignatti Morano to Judge Chapman,
4	United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern
5	District of New York, dated January 6, 2015,
6	Bates stamped Marsoner00000622 and 623, marked
7	for identification)
8	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
9	Q. I'll represent to you that this
10	document was produced by you very recently, I
11	believe it was November 24th after Mr. Pignatti
12	had already been deposed, so Lehman Brothers did
13	not have the opportunity to ask Mr. Pignatti
14	about this document.
15	To me, and you can tell me if I'm
16	right or not, but this looks like a draft letter
17	from Mr. Pignatti to the bankruptcy court
18	regarding your claim on F1.
19	Is that correct?
20	A. That is correct, yes.
21	Q. Do you know if this is the original
22	draft that you had sent to Mr. Pignatti?
23	A. I absolutely do not know it, but since
24	it is dated 6 January and the final letter is
25	dated 7 January, the conclusion that this is the

1	MARSONER
2	prior version, and his text here on e-mail dated
3	7 January and there on letterhead dated 7
4	January, would be his version after he has made
5	whatever markups he saw fit.
6	Q. As I state, this was produced to us on
7	November 24th.
8	Had you searched for this letter prior
9	to November?
10	A. Yeah, not only searched for it, I gave
11	it to my lawyers, and then in August with a full
12	intention of it to be disclosed to you. I have
13	nothing to hide in my conversations with any of
14	the three people that submitted letters on my
15	behalf.
16	Q. Okay.
17	A. I find it very kind of them to have
18	taken the time and I gave them convenience
19	drafts so as to minimize the amount of time they
20	would have to spend.
21	Q. Okay. What I would like to do is
22	let's look at this draft letter and the final
23	letter side by side so we can compare Exhibit 18
24	to Exhibit 16.
25	If you look if you look at the

1	MARSONER
2	draft, in the second paragraph, second sentence,
3	it states well, we'll start with the yeah,
4	second sentence, second paragraph: Previously I
5	was the head of European M&A and vice chairman
6	of Lehman Brothers Europe Limited from 2000 to
7	2006.
8	The second paragraph, second line of
9	the final letter which is Exhibit 16 states:
10	Previously I was the head of European M&A and
11	vice chairman of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc.
12	from 1999 to 2006.
13	Do you know he originally stated he
14	was vice chairman of Lehman Brothers Europe
15	Limited.
16	Do you know why he changed that to
17	Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc.?
18	MR. VAN TOL: Object to the form.
19	Misstates evidence.
20	A. We have to assume that the 6 January
21	draft is a draft produced by my lawyers. The 7
22	January letter is one that Pignatti himself
23	marked up and instructed his secretary to sign.
24	So Pignatti corrected my lawyer's
25	false understanding that he was a VC of Europe

1	MARSONER
2	Limited and put in the correct reality that he
3	was a VC of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. I
4	told you earlier both Pignatti and Magnoni were
5	very, very proud of their US roles. It was rare
6	for Europeans to have very senior US roles at
7	Lehman.
8	Q. Did you have a conversation with
9	Pignatti about this change?
10	A. No. No.
11	Q. If you look at the fifth paragraph of
12	the draft letter which is Exhibit 18, the last
13	two sentences of the paragraph: As was
14	customary, when a transaction was not explicitly
15	covered by one of the contracts, Lehman still
16	intended to pay Dr. Marsoner a success fee for
17	his F1 advice. Lehman accepted Dr. Marsoner's
18	requested remuneration by e-mail and orally.
19	Do you see that?
20	A. Yeah.
21	Q. Now, let's look at the same paragraph,
22	paragraph five of the final letter which is
23	Exhibit 16. The last two lines read: As was
24	customary, when a transaction was not explicitly
25	covered by specific advisory contract with a

1	MARSONER
2	person like Dr. Marsoner who is a former
3	employee and recurrent provider of services,
4	Lehman still intended to pay Dr. Marsoner a
5	success fee for his advice.
6	Do you see that?
7	A. I see that, yes.
8	Q. Now, the sentence: Lehman accepted
9	Dr. Marsoner's requested remuneration by e-mail
10	and orally was removed from the original draft
11	and not included in the final draft.
12	Do you see that?
13	A. Not entirely. Pignatti just stated it
14	more elegantly. He stated it in this letter in
15	the same way he stated it at his deposition.
16	Lehman still intended to pay Dr.
17	Marsoner a success fee for his F1 advice. These
18	are his words, not a draft that I or my lawyers
19	submitted to him. And it was more clumsy
20	wording saying essentially the same thing, and
21	he presented a more elegant wording. That's
22	great.
23	Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr.
24	Pignatti why he deleted the statement: Lehman
25	accepted Dr. Marsoner's requested remuneration

1	MARSONER
2	by e-mail and orally?
3	A. No, you see here how he decided this.
4	He marked it up, instructed his secretary to
5	.pdf it and print it out. I was not consulted.
6	Q. Unfortunately, Dr. Marsoner, we didn't
7	have a chance to ask Mr. Pignatti about this
8	because we didn't have the document during his
9	deposition.
10	MR. VAN TOL: We understand that.
11	That's the third time you said it. Doesn't make
12	it any more true or less true.
13	MS. ALVAREZ: That's fine.
14	Q. So I am going I have a few more
15	questions about this letter.
16	A. I understand.
17	Q. If you don't know, that's fine. I
18	understand why you wouldn't know.
19	The last actually the sixth
20	paragraph, last sentence of the draft states:
21	Without Dr. Marsoner's advice, Lehman may well
22	not have reinvested in F1, and instead may well
23	have sold most of its interests at the same time
24	as JPMorgan.
25	Do you see that?

1	MARSONER
2	A. Hm-hmm.
3	Q. If we can look at Exhibit 16, same
4	paragraph, that line reads: Without Dr.
5	Marsoner's advice, Lehman may well not have
6	reinvested in F1, and instead may well have sold
7	all of its interests at the same time as
8	JPMorgan.
9	Do you know why Mr. Pignatti changed
10	the word "most" in Exhibit 18 to the word "all"
11	in Exhibit 16?
12	A. Because he obviously knew more than I
13	did and knew that Lehman was actively
14	contemplating selling all of its interest.
15	My point in the draft letter was
16	simply mirroring the JPMorgan action. JPMorgan
17	sold down from 17 percent to 3 percent, and I
18	assumed that it would have been sort of an
19	obvious course of action for Lehman to follow as
20	well, but Pignatti actually tightened up that
21	wording and said the alternative to staying in
22	was to get outdoor together which would have
23	been even more expensive than the JPMorgan
24	course of action.
25	Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr.

1	MARSONER
2	Pignatti about this edit?
3	A. No, I did not.
4	Q. Let's look at the last sentence of the
5	draft letter which again is Exhibit 18.
6	The last sentence in the draft reads:
7	It was always my understanding that Lehman would
8	pay Dr. Marsoner 10 percent of Lehman's gross
9	revenues from the F1 investment.
10	Do you see that?
11	A. I can see that, yes.
12	Q. The last sentence of the final letter
13	which is Exhibit 16 reads: It was my
14	understanding that Dr. Marsoner would have been
15	paid by Lehman Brothers for his services
16	concerning the F1 investment or I would not have
17	asked him to help.
18	Do you see that?
19	A. I see that, yes.
20	Q. Do you see how the final letter does
21	not state that Lehman would pay Dr. Marsoner 10
22	percent of the gross revenues?
23	A. I don't see that at all. It says it
24	much more elegantly.
25	Q. Where does it say in this final letter

1	MARSONER	
2	that Lehman would pay Dr. Marsoner 10 percent of	
3	Lehman's gross revenues from the F1 investment?	
4	A. It says it in the paragraph above: F1	
5	services similar in nature to the BAWAG.	
6	Marsoner received approximately 10 percent.	
7	And then in Pignatti's customary	
8	elegance he got rid of the tautology of the last	
9	sentence here, and in his own words, Pignatti,	
10	unprompted, said: Would have been paid or I	
11	would not have asked him to help.	
12	With that he confirms my contention	
13	that Pignatti actively in his capacity, as he	
14	made clear, vice chairman of Lehman Brothers	
15	Holdings Inc., asked me to help on F1 and fully	
16	intended to pay me.	
17	He also confirms that my services were	
18	similar to BAWAG where I got 10 percent. The	
19	way I read this, he could not have been clearer.	
20	Q. Well, this letter says the final	
21	letter states that you received 10 percent of	
22	Lehman's gross revenues in BAWAG, correct?	
23	A. The final letter says, yes, for	
24	similar services to F1 I got 10 percent.	
25	Q. And the draft letter states that it	

1	MARSONER
2	was Pignatti's understanding that Lehman would
3	pay Dr. Marsoner 10 percent of Lehman's gross
4	revenues from F1, correct?
5	A. Redundant. His letter is more
6	concise, more elegant and, if anything, says it
7	more strongly.
8	Q. But the draft letter does state that
9	Dr. Marsoner that you would receive 10
10	percent of the Lehman's gross revenues from the
11	F1 investment?
12	MR. VAN TOL: Objection, asked and
13	answered twice.
14	You can answer it again.
15	Q. Answer the question, please.
16	A. The draft is clumsy, redundant and
17	tautological. The final version is elegant and
18	says exactly what I'm contending in Vittorio
19	Pignatti's own words.
20	Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr.
21	Pignatti about how he made the why he made
22	these changes?
23	A. No. No. You had seen that I was not
24	consulted. He instructed his secretary
25	directly, and just did me the courtesy of

1	MARSONER
2	letting me have a copy.
3	MS. ALVAREZ: I think the videographer
4	needs to switch tapes.
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:35
6	p.m. and we are going off the record.
7	(Recess)
8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This begins media
9	unit number five. The time is 4:54 p.m. and we
10	are back on the record.
11	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
12	Q. I'm going to mark another document as
13	an exhibit. This will be Exhibit 19.
14	(Marsoner Exhibit 19, Single-page
15	letter from Ruggero Magnoni to Judge Chapman,
16	United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern
17	District of New York, dated January 14, 2015,
18	and bearing no Bates stamp, marked for
19	identification)
20	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
21	Q. This is the letter that Mr. Magnoni
22	submitted to the bankruptcy court, and it is
23	dated January 14, 2015.
24	Do you see that, Dr. Marsoner?
25	A. I see that, yes.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. How did it come to be that Ruggero
3	Magnoni submitted this letter to the bankruptcy
4	court?
5	A. I asked him to do so and I provided
6	the usual convenience draft for him.
7	Q. Did Mr. Magnoni make any edits to the
8	draft you provided to him?
9	A. I do not remember exactly, but I
10	believe that if he made edits they were very
11	light. He may well not have made any.
12	Q. Do you remember how many drafts were
13	exchanged?
14	A. Again, I do not remember precisely,
15	but I suspect he may just have accepted the
16	draft I submitted to him. I do not remember any
17	comments from him and I certainly do not
18	remember discussing this with him in any way.
19	MS. ALVAREZ: Let's take a look at the
20	next exhibit which is Marsoner 71 to 72, and
21	this will be Exhibit 20.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	MARSONER
2	(Marsoner Exhibit 20, Single-page
3	e-mail from Thomas Marsoner to Ruggero Magnoni,
4	dated January 14, 2015, with single-page
5	attachment, Bates stamped Marsoner00000071 and
6	721, marked for identification)
7	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
8	Q. Now, this is Bates stamped Marsoner 71
9	to 72. It is an e-mail from you, Dr. Marsoner,
10	to Ruggero Magnoni, with Vittorio Pignatti cc'd,
11	dated January 14, 2015.
12	Do you see that?
13	A. I see that, yes.
14	Q. In the well, the first paragraph
15	you state: Having discovered along the way that
16	I ought to have a claim in the US for the
17	services I provided, I have decided to pursue a
18	claim in respect of the LB/F1 matters.
19	Do you see that?
20	A. Yeah.
21	Q. Now, in the second paragraph you
22	state: With reference to our discussions around
23	this, I would be very grateful if you could
24	please look at the draft letter attached, check
25	to confirm it reflects reality accurately, mark

1	MARSONER
2	it up wherever you think it might not, and send
3	a scanned, signed version back to me.
4	Do you see that?
5	A. I see that, yes.
6	Q. What are you referring to when you
7	say: With reference to our discussions?
8	A. Just like in the Pignatti case,
9	Magnoni and I have been discussing F1 since
10	1998. Magnoni had also kindly put in a letter
11	for me in the UK case and I would assume that I,
12	you know, that I was preannounced this e-mail
13	before I sent it, either in a conversation or
14	leaving him a voice mail or something along
15	those lines.
16	Q. Do you recall what conversation you
17	had with him about asserting a claim against
18	Lehman US prior to sending him this e-mail?
19	A. No, I no, nothing beyond what that
20	e-mail says.
21	Q. Did you have a conversation with
22	Magnoni after you sent him this draft?
23	A. No, I do not think I did. I do not
24	think I did. I think the facts in this letter
25	are very, very clear and very uncontentious. My

1	MARSONER
2	best recollection is he just accepted the draft,
3	signed it and sent it back.
4	Q. Okay.
5	MS. ALVAREZ: We will mark hopefully
6	the final exhibit this is Exhibit 21.
7	(Marsoner Exhibit 21, 11-page document
8	entitled Plan Administrators' First Set of
9	Document Requests to Dr. Thomas Marsoner
10	Pursuant to Rules 7026 and 7034 of the Federal
11	Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, bearing no Bates
12	stamps, marked for identification)
13	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
14	Q. Exhibit 21 is entitled: Plan
15	administrators' document request to Dr. Thomas
16	Marsoner pursuant to rules 7026 and 7024 of the
17	Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.
18	Have you seen this document before,
19	Dr. Marsoner?
20	A. I do believe so. I hope you will
21	understand that I cannot be certain because
22	there is an awful lot of language in here that
23	to a nonpracticing lawyer looks like legalese
24	boilerplate that you experts are here to
25	understand.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Do you understand what this is, what
3	Exhibit 21 is?
4	A. Yeah, I believe that this is
5	further asks me to produce all the relevant
6	documents in my possession, particularly here
7	the, you know, Pignatti, Magnoni and Bernard
8	correspondence, all of which I, of course,
9	immediately produced to counsel.
10	Q. Do you see how starting on page 8
11	through page 10, specific categories or types of
12	documents are described and called for
13	production?
14	A. Yeah, yeah, I mean, I see that there
15	is a lot of stuff in here.
16	Q. When was the first time that you saw
17	Exhibit 21?
18	A. I think it was in the summer as an
19	attachment to an e-mail, but I cannot recall
20	exactly on what date that was.
21	Q. Did you conduct a search to locate
22	documents that are requested?
23	A. Yes, of course. Yes, of course I did.
24	Q. What did you do to locate responsive
25	documents?

1	MARSONER
2	A. I used the key words here, Magnoni,
3	Pignatti and so on, and then forwarded those in
4	one bunch to counsel. And in terms of older
5	things, being through this exercise once before
6	for the UK case, I asked Hogan Lovells US to get
7	ahold of the Hogan Lovells UK file.
8	Q. So those key words that you put
9	together, what did you how did you use those
10	key words?
11	A. I mean, specifically, you know,
12	Bernard, Pignatti, Magnoni words, to be honest I
13	was a little bit surprised seeing that, this is
14	my first sort of full blown US court case,
15	punched them in, up came the whole
16	correspondence and forwarded it.
17	Q. What I'm trying to understand is where
18	did you punch them in? Are you talking about
19	e-mails?
20	A. My laptop, yeah.
21	Q. So you were searching e-mails on your
22	laptop?
23	A. Yes. Yes.
24	Q. What about your hard drive, did you
25	search your hard drive?

1	MARSONER
2	A. I do not I mean, I have a laptop
3	which is connected to iCloud. I do not have a
4	server as such.
5	Q. What about thumb drives or any other
6	type of media where you may have stored
7	documents?
8	A. You have seen from this case, I am
9	hard of hearing. I do an awful lot of stuff by
10	e-mail, so I would not, other than in my e-mail,
11	I would really not know where to look for
12	things.
13	Q. Did you look through paper files?
14	A. You know, yes, of course, I looked
15	through my paper files, but those paper files
16	nowadays tend to be printouts of things that
17	were sent by e-mail.
18	Q. Where were those paper files located?
19	A. I have some in my home office in
20	London, I have some in our house in Lake
21	Millstatt in Austria. Those are the two main
22	desks that I have where I have where I still
23	have paper files, yes.
24	Q. So just to confirm, you searched your
25	paper files in London?

1	MARSONER
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And you searched your paper files in
4	Austria?
5	A. Yes. Yes.
6	Q. Do you have paper files anywhere else?
7	A. No.
8	MS. ALVAREZ: We're done with our
9	questioning. Thank you, Dr. Marsoner.
10	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
11	MR. VAN TOL: I have questions.
12	EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. VAN TOL:
14	Q. Dr. Marsoner, could you please turn to
15	Exhibit 7 that was marked today?
16	You may recall seeing this earlier,
17	this is the e-mail chain regarding sweat equity.
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. I would like to draw your attention to
20	the first page which is LEH 201.
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. In the middle of the page do you see
23	there is a March 5 e-mail from Mr. Meissner to
24	Mr. Pignatti, the time is 16:36:37?
25	A. Yes.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. In the second paragraph Mr. Meissner
3	writes: He is supposed to get a significant
4	and there is a missing word, probably fee
5	from IBD for his work which he deserves in my
6	opinion.
7	Do you know to whom Mr. Meissner is
8	referring there?
9	A. That's referring to me.
10	Q. In the next sentence Mr. Meissner
11	says: IBD fees (net) should be in the region of
12	25 million, so he'll expect around 2.5 million,
13	and I'm okay with that given his contribution.
14	Do you have an understanding of what
15	is meant there?
16	A. That's the margin loan, financing fee
17	of which the established practice is that I
18	would get 10 percent, yes.
19	Q. All right. And let's go to the e-mail
20	above that which is Mr. Pignatti's response.
21	Do you see Mr. Pignatti says: "So
22	let's compensate him with 10 percent and
23	eventually throw in extra 100K."
24	Do you see that?
25	A. Yeah, I see that.

1	MARSONER
2	Q. Do you have an understanding what Mr.
3	Pignatti means there?
4	A. He just confirms the 10 percent of
5	financing fees that Meissner states as a matter
6	of fact, and then he says, as I understand it,
7	as an extra tip for the extra work on the small
8	co-investment that the Lehman fund Pignatti ran
9	would make, let's give him an extra tip of a
10	hundred thousand. Euros, I presume.
11	Q. How if at all does the 10 percent
12	referred to in Marsoner 7 relate to the 2004
13	agreement to your understanding?
14	A. It's the result of the math that gives
15	me 20 percent of IBD fees which in the case of
16	financing would be 20 percent of half of the
17	financing fees, which would translate to 10
18	percent of the firm revenues in the case of
19	financings and principal investments.
20	MR. VAN TOL: I would like to have
21	this marked as Marsoner 22, please.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	MARSONER
2	(Marsoner Exhibit 22, Multipage
3	document entitled Notice of Hearing on Motion of
4	Dr. Thomas Marsoner to Deem Proofs of Claim to
5	be Timely Filed by the Claims Bar Date, with
6	multiple attachments, and bearing no Bates
7	stamps, marked for identification)
8	BY MR. VAN TOL:
9	Q. Dr. Marsoner, several times during
10	today's testimony you have referred to an e-mail
11	from a Graham Wilson.
12	Who is Graham Wilson?
13	A. Graham Wilson was the chief
14	administrative officer of Lehman Brothers
15	investment banking in Europe.
16	Q. You also referred to a spreadsheet
17	that Mr. Wilson prepared, do you recall that?
18	A. I recall that.
19	Q. I would like to turn your attention in
20	Marsoner 22 to Exhibit F.
21	Are you there?
22	A. Yes, I can see that.
23	Q. What is this document?
24	A. It's an e-mail from Graham Wilson to
25	me apologizing for a delay, but now authorized

1	MARSONER
2	to agree and move forward with processing the
3	payment, and attached to that e-mail is the
4	spreadsheet that shows precisely how my fees for
5	the various components of the Cerberus BAWAG
6	acquisition was calculated.
7	Q. Could you explain this schedule for
8	us, please?
9	A. Sure. Starting with what we just
10	discussed earlier, the 25 million that Meissner
11	had estimated turned out to have been 22,154,688
12	Euros.
13	Q. Could you tell us where you see that
14	number? Could you describe it for us?
15	A. It's in the second line: Cerberus
16	BAWAG leveraged financing fees.
17	Q. Okay. Please continue.
18	A. Financing fees were shared 50-50
19	between the fixed income department and the
20	investment banking department. Where it then
21	says net IB revenues, there is something like 11
22	million. 20 percent of those 11 million amount
23	to 2.215 million Euros.
24	So that shows in two steps how the 10
25	percent of firm revenues that were the

1	MARSONER
2	established standard between Lehman and me came
3	about in financing fees.
4	Q. Underneath there there is a box that
5	says less, L-E-S-S. It lists several things.
6	Can you explain what the function of
7	those numbers is?
8	A. Yes. Retainer fees, the earnest fees
9	that we discussed earlier were always deducted
10	from eventual success fees, and this shows
11	this shows how those quarterly retainer fees
12	that I was paid, how those were deducted from
13	the success fee so that I would be paid a net
14	success fee.
15	Those are the two top
16	Q. Are those the same retainer fees that
17	we saw referred to earlier in the 2004
18	agreement?
19	A. Oh, yeah, absolutely.
20	Q. Is there anything else on this chart
21	that you want to explain to us or have we
22	covered it all?
23	A. There is one very important thing,
24	that is, on line 4 and 5, you'll see two
25	principal gains. One is FX hedging where the

1	MARSONER
2	firm made \$388,000 in that case, and another
3	principal gain out of a notional interest rate
4	swap by the firm again made \$552,000.
5	As per the formula in the '04
6	agreement by the way, also know the other
7	agreements that principal gain was, again,
8	divided 50-50 between the fixed income
9	department and investment banking, 20 percent
10	thereof, or 10 percent of firm revenues produced
11	the amount that I was owed.
12	Q. In the third line down in the top box
13	there is a reference to M&A fee.
14	Could you explain what that is?
15	A. The M&A fee is the mergers and
16	acquisitions fee. That belonged to the
17	investment banking department alone. Fixed
18	income had no share in that, and my 20 percent
19	of M&A fees remained 20 percent, so that in this
20	case I was paid nearly 2.8 million Euros out of
21	the M&A fee that Lehman made for Cerberus BAWAG.
22	Q. Why did you refer to the Graham Wilson
23	spreadsheet several times during your testimony
24	today?
25	A. Because it shows so very clearly that

1	MARSONER
2	these percentages did not have to be in any
3	specific formal agreement. These percentages
4	were agreed between Lehman and me throughout our
5	advisory relationship. This was not in the '04
6	agreement, this was not in the '06 agreement.
7	It was exactly, like Formula One, governed by
8	the text and spirit of the 'O4 agreement and, as
9	you can also see in the previous discussion
10	between Pignatti and Meissner not involving me
11	in any way, completely noncontroversial between
12	all of various senior Lehman decision makers.
13	Q. Let's go back to that exhibit, please,
14	Exhibit 7, the e-mail exchange you were just
15	talking about.
16	A. Yeah.
17	Q. Do you see that in this e-mail
18	exchange there is at least two e-mails from you,
19	correct? There is the original one from you to
20	Mr. Pignatti, and then there is one on page 201
21	from, again, you to Mr. Pignatti, correct?
22	A. That's right, yes.
23	Q. I don't see any reference in those to
24	10 percent.
25	Why did you not say to Mr. Pignatti:

1	MARSONER
2	I would like 10 percent?
3	A. I didn't have to. What I was asking
4	Vittorio here was something completely unrelated
5	to what the Graham Wilson e-mail states. Here I
6	was looking for something extra on a little
7	extra deal that happened around the big BAWAG
8	Cerberus deal where I thought I had provided
9	additional services on something other than
10	Cerberus BAWAG.
11	Ultimately I got nothing for that,
12	which is okay. Sweat equity would have become
13	worthless. It was not a very successful
14	investment originally.
15	Q. Now I would like to move on to another
16	topic.
17	We discussed earlier your claim
18	relating to LBI, LBCC and the collar, do you
19	recall that?
20	A. I recall it, yes.
21	Q. Do you recall when that claim was
22	submitted?
23	A. That must have been very soon after
24	the Lehman bankruptcy in September of '08.
25	Q. At that time did you have US counsel

1	MARSONER
2	advising you on the submission of that claim?
3	A. No, not at all.
4	Q. When did you hire this firm, Hogan
5	Lovells LLP, to assist with the claim that's at
6	issue in this case?
7	A. Relatively soon after the UK
8	settlement. The UK settlement was, I believe,
9	in June of 2014, so I believe I hired Hogan
10	Lovells US in September, October of 2014.
11	Q. My last set of questions has to do
12	with Marsoner Exhibit 12, if you would like to
13	turn to that.
14	A. Yeah.
15	Q. I want to draw your attention to the
16	first page of this exhibit.
17	Do you see that it's a progress report
18	and that it's dated April 20, 2010?
19	A. Yes. I can see that.
20	Q. Do you know when you were asked
21	earlier about the bar date in this US
22	proceeding, do you know when the bar date was?
23	A. To this day I do not know it
24	precisely, but it must be in our motion.
25	Q. Sure. Let me see if I can just oh,

1	MARSONER
2	we have it marked here.
3	Let me just show you, to speed things
4	up, this is page 3 of our motion, paragraph two.
5	Do you see a reference to a September
6	22, 2009 bar date?
7	A. Yes. I can see it, yes.
8	Q. So do you see that the bar date is in
9	fact before the progress report dated April 20,
10	2010?
11	A. By more than half a year.
12	MR. VAN TOL: Thank you. Subject to
13	any other redirect, that's all I have at this
14	time.
15	MS. ALVAREZ: We have a couple more
16	questions.
17	EXAMINATION
18	BY MS. ALVAREZ:
19	Q. Dr. Marsoner, if you go back to the
20	Graham Wilson e-mail which is Exhibit F to the
21	document marked Exhibit 22 during this
22	deposition?
23	A. Yeah.
24	Q. If you could take a look at it.
25	I'm just reading the text of the

1	MARSONER
2	e-mail: Thomas, apologies for the delay, am now
3	authorized to agree with you and move forward
4	with processing the payment.
5	Do you see that?
6	A. Yes, I see that.
7	Q. Now, you testified that this e-mail
8	concerned your compensation for your work on
9	BAWAG, is that right?
10	A. Most of it, yes.
11	Q. Graham Wilson here states that he is
12	now authorized to agree this with you.
13	Do you know who authorized this?
14	A. No, I do not.
15	Q. Does a similar e-mail exist with
16	regard to your work on F1?
17	A. Does
18	MR. VAN TOL: If it does, please
19	produce it.
20	l'm sorry, you may answer.
21	A. This sorry, your question is does
22	the equivalent of this e-mail exist relating to
23	my work on F1?
24	Q. That's right.
25	A. That, with respect, is an
1	

1	MARSONER
2	impossibility. The fees, the gross revenues
3	that are shown here for BAWAG Cerberus in the F1
4	case only materialized in May or June of 2012 at
5	which point Lehman had been bankrupt for more
6	than four years.
7	Q. Does there exist an e-mail indicating
8	payment had been authorized by Lehman to you for
9	F1?
10	A. It's the same answer. Revenues had to
11	crystalize first, only then could such an
12	attachment or such a cover e-mail be produced.
13	The earliest date it could have been
14	produced would have been May or June of 2012.
15	At that point Lehman wasn't around any more.
16	MS. ALVAREZ: That's all we have.
17	(Pause)
18	MR. VAN TOL: We have no further
19	questions either, thank you.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	MARSONER
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 5:24
3	p.m. on December 15, 2015 and this completes
4	today's video deposition of Thomas Marsoner.
5	* * *
6	END OF PROCEEDING
7	Time noted 5:24 p.m.
8	* * *
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	DR. THOMAS MARSONER
14	
15	Subscribed and sworn to before me
16	thisday of, 2015.
17	
18	
19	
20	NOTARY PUBLIC
21	
22	
23	My Commission expires:
24	
25	
1	

1 2 E R R A T A
2 FRRATA
3 STATE OF NEW YORK
4 COUNTY OF NEW YORK
5 I wish to make the following changes, for the
6 following reasons:
7 PAGE LINE
8 CHANGE:
9 REASON:
10 CHANGE:
11 REASON:
12 CHANGE:
13 REASON:
14 CHANGE:
15 REASON:
16 CHANGE:
17 REASON:
18 CHANGE:
19 REASON:
20 CHANGE:
21 REASON:
22
23
24
DR. THOMAS MARSONER

1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	STATE OF NEW YORK
4	COUNTY OF NEW YORK
5	
6	I, BRANDON RAINOFF, a Federal Certified
7	Realtime Reporter and Notary Public within and for
8	the State of New York, do hereby certify:
9	That DR. THOMAS MARSONER, the witness
10	whose deposition is hereinbefore set forth, was duly
11	sworn by me and that such deposition is a true record
12	of the testimony given by the witness.
13	I further certify that I am not related
14	to any of the parties to this action by blood or
15	marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the
16	outcome of this matter.
17	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
18	my hand this 15th day of December, 2015.
19	
20	
21	
22	BRANDON RAINOFF, FCRR, RMR, CRR
23	
24	
25	

1			
2			ERRATA
3	STATE OF N	NEW YORK	
4	COUNTY O	F NEW YORK	
5	I wish	n to make the fo	ollowing changes, for the following reasons:
6	PAGE LINE		
7	<u>17 4</u>	CHANGE:	"the" to "a"
8		REASON:	Dr. Marsoner was not the only managing director.
9	24 2	CHANGE:	"recall" to "call"
10		REASON:	The correct phrase is "conference call"
11	<u>25</u> <u>21</u>	CHANGE:	"you" to "he"
12		REASON:	"he" is the correct pronoun
13	30 25	CHANGE:	"Ruppert" to "Rupert"
14		REASON:	Misspelled name
15	31 11-13	CHANGE:	"Ruppert" to "Rupert"
16		REASON:	Misspelled name
17	<u>37</u> <u>15</u>	CHANGE:	"Hannon" to "Hannan"
18		REASON:	Misspelled name
19	38 22	CHANGE:	"telephoning" to "telephone"
20		REASON:	Misspelled word
21	40 15	CHANGE:	"with" to "that"
22		REASON:	Incorrect word
23	44 12	CHANGE:	"were" to "are"
24		REASON:	Incorrect word
25			

1						
2				ERRATA		
3	STAT	STATE OF NEW YORK				
4	COU	COUNTY OF NEW YORK				
5		I wish	to make the fo	ollowing changes, for the following reasons:		
6	PAGE	ELINE				
7	<u>51</u>	<u>15</u>	CHANGE:	"Nicky Lauder" to "Niki Lauda"		
8			REASON:	Misspelled name		
9	<u>57`</u>	<u>18</u>	CHANGE:	"got" to "gone"		
10			REASON:	Incorrect word		
11	61	<u>24</u>	CHANGE:	Delete "for"		
12			REASON:	Unnecessary word		
13	<u>79</u>	<u>18</u>	CHANGE:	"Blackstone" to "Blackrock"		
14			REASON:	Incorrect company		
15	90	<u>22</u>	CHANGE:	Insert "Quod" before "Erat"		
16			REASON:	Incorrect phrase		
17	<u>102</u>	<u>13</u>	CHANGE:	Delete "being"		
18			REASON:	Unnecessary word		
19	103	24_	CHANGE:	"Revco" to "Refco"		
20			REASON:	Incorrect company name		
21	<u>110</u>	<u>5</u>	CHANGE:	"Biergen Kreiger" to "Jürgen Krieger"		
22			REASON:	Misspelled name		
23	118	9	CHANGE:	"credit risk committee" to "creditors' committee"		
24			REASON:	Dr. Marsoner and Bruce Matthews served on the creditors'		
25				committee		

1				
2				ERRATA
3	STAT	TE OF N	NEW YORK	
4	COUNTY OF NEW YORK			
5		I wish	to make the fo	ollowing changes, for the following reasons:
6	PAGI	E LINE		
7	<u>124</u>	22_	CHANGE:	"heard" to "had"
8			REASON:	Incorrect word
9	136	21	CHANGE:	"." after "LBEL" to "?"
10			REASON:	Dr. Marsoner was asking whether Ms. Alvarez meant LBEL
11				because he is only aware of the LBEL proof of claim form, not
12				the LBI proof of claim form
13	<u>137</u>	<u>17</u>	CHANGE:	Delete "because"
14			REASON:	Unnecessary word
15	140	11-12	CHANGE:	"Casa Peliganos, Costa Keretes" to "Casa Pelicanos Costa
16				Careyes"
17			REASON:	Incorrect address
18	140-4	1 25-2	CHANGE:	"Casa Carrion Parco, San Giacomo" to "Casa Carpione Parco
19				San Giacomo"
20			REASON:	Incorrect address
21	141	5	CHANGE:	"only" to "Lake"
22			REASON:	Incorrect word
23	153	<u>5</u>	CHANGE:	Insert "have" after "would"
24			REASON:	Necessary word
25				

1				
2				ERRATA
3	STA	TE OF	NEW YORK	
4	COU	NTY O	F NEW YORK	
5		I wisl	h to make the f	ollowing changes, for the following reasons:
6	PAGI	E LINE		
7	<u>159</u>	<u>19</u>	CHANGE:	"Meine agide" to "Meine Aegide"
8			REASON:	Misspelled word
9	<u>161</u>	<u>17</u>	CHANGE:	"2002" to "2009"
10			REASON:	Incorrect year
11	<u>161</u>	<u>23</u>	CHANGE:	"corrected" to "correct it"
12			REASON:	Incorrect word
13	<u>169</u>	24	CHANGE:	"supported" to "supporting"
14			REASON:	Incorrect word
15	<u>180</u>	<u>22</u>	CHANGE:	"outdoor together" to "out altogether"
16			REASON:	Incorrect phrase
17	198	<u>6</u>	CHANGE:	"know" to "in"
18			REASON:	Incorrect word
19				
20				Moura
21				DR. THOMAS MARSONER
22				
23				
24				
25				